




NUNC COGNOSCO EX PARTE



TRENT UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2019 with funding from  
Kahle/Austin Foundation







THE  
CANADIAN  
HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION

Report of the Annual Meeting  
held at Kingston, June 7-10, 1950

With Historical Papers

Edited by R. A. PRESTON, G. F. G. STANLEY  
and L. LAMONTAGNE

THE CANADIAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION  
1949-1950

*Past Presidents*

Abbé ARTHUR MAHEUX  
F. H. SOWARD

*President*

A. L. BURT

*Vice-President*

G. E. WILSON

*English Secretary and Treasurer*

D. M. L. FARR

*French Secretary*

SÉRAPHIN MARION

*Editor, Canadian Historical Association Report*

R. A. PRESTON

*Associate Editors*

G. F. G. STANLEY  
L. LAMONTAGNE

*Council*

J. C. BONENFANT, Quebec, P.Q.	G. O. ROTHNEY, Montreal, P.Q.
JAMES A. GIBSON, Ottawa, Ont.	C. P. STACEY, Ottawa, Ont.
D. G. G. KERR, Sackville, N.B.	A. M. FRASER, St. John's, Nfld.
K. M. SETTON, Winnipeg, Man.	HILDA NEATBY, Saskatoon, Sask.
NORMAN FEE, Ottawa, Ont.	G. F. G. STANLEY, Kingston, Ont.
G. P. DE T. GLAZEBROOK, Ottawa, Ont.	MARCEL TRUDEL, Quebec, P.Q.



## CONTENTS

Broad Horizons. By A. L. BURT	1
The Queen's Rangers and Their Contribution in the Years 1776 to 1784. By H. M. JACKSON	11
Habits gris et chemise rouge. Par LÉOPOLD LAMONTAGNE	20
Sir Sam Hughes and the Problem of Imperialism. By SAM H. S. HUGHES	30
Lamartine et la jeunesse républicaine du Canada français en 1848. Par SÉRAPHIN MARION	42
Le Fort Frontenac ou Catarakoui sous le régime français. Par ANTOINE ROY	51
Historical Restorations. By RONALD L. WAY	58
The Honourable Richard Cartwright. By JAMES A. ROY	64
Sir John Macdonald and Kingston. By D. G. CREIGHTON	72
National Historic Parks and Sites, 1949-1950. By the National Parks and Historic Sites Service, Development Services Branch, Department of Resources and Development	81
Report of the Secretary and Treasurer. By W. G. ORMSBY	87
List of Members and Affiliated Organizations	91

The editors are grateful to the authors of the above papers for their co-operation in shortening them from their original length so that they could be published in the amount of space available.

One paper presented at the Association's annual meeting, "Quebec and the French Revolution of 1789" by Mr. Mason Wade, is appearing in the December 1950 issue of the *Canadian Historical Review*.

Articles in the CANADIAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION REPORT are indexed in the *Canadian Index*.

113200





## BROAD HORIZONS

Presidential Address by A. L. BURT

*University of Minnesota*

FORTY years ago the University of Toronto turned me out with an honours degree in Modern History and an unquestioning belief that Toronto was the best Canadian university. I do not know how I got that belief, but I do know that I got that degree without taking a course in Canadian history, for in my day Toronto offered none. All I knew about the subject was what I had learned in school, and it seemed to be one of the childish things that I had put away when I became a man.

On proceeding to Oxford, I was surprised to find that one of the special subjects offered by the School of Modern History was a rather intensive study of a short period of Canadian history. I did not choose it. My tutor chose it for me, and I still remember a smothered feeling of resentment at the thought of having to learn about the history of my own country from a man who had never lived in it. That feeling, of course, was an unconscious reaction of nationalism. But I was soon grateful to my tutor for sending me to sit at the feet of that ripe scholar, the late Professor Egerton, who introduced me to the source materials of Canadian history. He also made me look at the history of other parts of the British Empire, but I confess that on leaving Oxford I fell from grace and lost this wider view that he would have his students take.

Soon afterward the First World War burst upon us, intensifying national feeling in Canada as in other lands; and the rising tide of Canadian nationalism quickly made Canadian history an important study in all Canadian universities, including Toronto. Research in Canadian history became academically fashionable, perhaps too fashionable for the balanced development of some departments of history. It might have been healthier even for Canadian history if there had been equal encouragement of research in other fields of history, for the besetting sin of national history in every country is too exclusive a concern with what has happened within its own borders. The penalty is a squint-eyed view.

The writing of Canadian history has not been free of this besetting sin. Sometimes the consequent distortion has been conscious, to serve a real or a supposed national interest. But commonly it has been a more or less unconscious effect of nationalism, which by its very nature is introspective and is given to self-glorification and self-pity. It may be said in self-defence, and I believe it is true, that many other national histories have been written with a narrower outlook. This, however, does not mean that those of us who have dabbled or wallowed in Canadian history have possessed any distinctive virtue other than what has been forced upon us.

Canadian historians have had to take a wider view simply because Canada was the child of France and Great Britain, because it grew up within the British imperial fold, and because it has been indissolubly married to the American giant. French history, English history, imperial

history, and American history thrust themselves into Canadian history, giving it broad horizons. Scanning these broad horizons enlarges the vision and deepens the insight.

It has been urged that more English history should be studied in French Canada, French history in English Canada, and American history in both parts of Canada. But the need for more study of imperial history in Canada seems to have been neglected. This, I think, is unfortunate if only because Canadian history, when examined in the light of the history of the Empire, gains much in perspective and in depth of meaning. As penance for my fall from grace when I "went down" from Oxford, I would now draw attention to a few features, taken at random, of the imperial background of Canadian history.

On the morrow of the American Revolution, the British colonial empire was still confined to the North American continent and the adjacent islands. Most of its population was black, and of its white inhabitants the French outnumbered the English. Relatively speaking, Canada was then a much more important part of the Empire than it was a generation later.

From the long French war that intervened, the Empire emerged with conquests that profoundly changed its size and character. It was now a world empire, demographically as well as geographically. The problem presented by the acquisition of Canada in 1763, that of incorporating a foreign body, was thus multiplied manifold; and this gave rise to a new form of British colonial government, that of the crown colonies. It was borrowed from the despoiled empires, and under it the concentration of control in London was greatly accentuated. The only quarter where the Empire had gained new territory by settlement instead of conquest was in Australia, but because of the peculiar nature of this colony it was given the new type of rule. Now also, but for a different reason, imperial authority had begun to be more of a reality in the oldest parts of the colonial Empire which, from almost their very foundation in the seventeenth century, had enjoyed self-government. There, in the West Indies, the abuse of self-government by the whites was leading to growing interference by the home government to protect the blacks. Since the commencement of the long war with France in 1793, not a single British colony had been invested with representative institutions; and in 1815, when peace was at last secure, the British government had not the slightest intention of introducing them anywhere. It was a far cry from the age when it was taken for granted that every British colony should have a government modelled after that of the mother country.

As a matter of fact Britain was not the mother country of most of the lands now under her sway. She had not given birth to their people. She had conquered them from other empires, and she ruled them. She had once peopled her colonies with her own sons and daughters, and she was to do it again on a grander scale. But at this time her policy was opposed to emigration. She was a great imperial power, the only one left in the world; and the authority she wielded over her far-flung Empire was many times greater than it had ever been in any preceding age.



How could London handle the burden of managing an empire in which control was so centralized and whose character was so diversified? The answer came out of the war that raised the question. It was the Colonial Office, which began to take shape in 1812 and was fairly well formed by the middle twenties. At first the ministry was strongly reluctant to consult Parliament on colonial affairs, and Parliament was little disposed to pry into them, except in so far as they touched the sensitive subject of slavery. What was the reason for this mutual shyness, which favoured imperial autocracy? It was partly, but not wholly, the normal desire of a specialized government agency to conduct its business without interference from uninformed legislators, combined with the fact that most members of Parliament knew little and cared less about this business. It was also constitutional. The Colonial Office was little beholden to Parliament for authority to govern. The legal authority exercised by the Secretary of State over the colonies was that of the royal prerogative, which was unlimited in the crown colonies and very considerable in the others. Though Parliament could at will pare down the royal prerogative, it was chary of doing so lest it impair the efficiency of colonial administration in the future.

It was Australia that began to bring the Colonial Office and Parliament closer together on the management of the colonies, and what forced the change was the discovery that there was something constitutionally wrong "down under." Autocratic power had been quite properly conferred upon the Governor to rule a society of convicts and their guardians, but no provision had been made for the government of free settlers. Now the latter were becoming an important element in the population, and the Governor, without knowing he had no authority to do so, was ruling them too, even levying taxes upon them. By allowing this strange situation to develop, the Colonial Office exposed the ministry to a withering attack in 1819. Parliament promptly passed an act legalizing the illegal taxes, and the government promised to prepare an Australian constitution as soon as sufficient information could be gathered, for which purpose a royal commissioner was sent to Australia. From this time forth the relations between the Colonial Office and Parliament were the opposite of what they had been. The ministers had learned a wholesome lesson. Never again would the Colonial Office shelter itself behind the royal prerogative, much less stretch the prerogative beyond the legal limits. The department would rather look to Parliament for support in administering the colonies, and to this end it undertook the education of Parliament. Therefore in 1822 the Secretary of State inaugurated the policy of publishing an annual "blue book" for each colony.

The first Australian constitution, based on the voluminous reports of the royal commissioner, was enacted by Parliament in 1823. Van Diemen's Land was separated from New South Wales, and each was provided with a governor and a council. The omission of an assembly is in marked contrast with what had been done for Canada a generation previously, when Pitt's government had felt bound by the Declaratory Act of 1778 to establish an assembly as the only remaining means of rais-

ing the necessary colonial revenue. But the times had changed, there had been no popular demand in Australia for an assembly, and there was no pressing need to levy new taxes there. The old ones sufficed and they were no longer unconstitutional, Parliament having clothed them with its own authority. As for the Canadian precedent of 1791, Canadian experience had robbed it of much of its value in English eyes. The Colonial Office was out of patience with the French-Canadian Assembly for its obstructionist tactics. Indeed, both in and out of Parliament there was a growing desire, in that age of mounting anti-imperialism, to get rid of the troubles of Canada by getting rid of Canada. This feeling reached such a pitch by 1828 that Huskisson, then Colonial Secretary, publicly rebuked those who harboured it.

Colonial self-government in the West Indies was also incurring the increasing displeasure of the British government and public. The Barbadian Assembly balked at making murder of a slave a felony, as required by the Colonial Office, until a special message was sent in the King's name; and in another island, martial law was proclaimed to bring about the execution of a Council member who delighted in torturing negroes to death. In the spring of 1823, the House of Commons unanimously adopted a government resolution for gradual emancipation by the progressive amelioration of slavery, and the government promised to enforce it upon the crown colonies and to press it upon the assemblies of the other colonies.

Instead of generous co-operation, the Colonial Secretary encountered bitter obstruction in the colonies, crown and chartered alike; and they were soon in an angrier uproar than that with which the continental colonies had begun the American Revolution. In January, 1831, a public meeting of planters and merchants in Grenada called for a West India congress; and two months later it met in Barbados, comprising members of the several legislatures who had been chosen by public meetings for this purpose. The congress passed some vigorous resolutions on the grievances of the Caribbean colonies, particularly the imperial interference with their property. Never before had anything like this occurred in the British West Indies. Angrier outbursts followed. In Jamaica at the end of the year, there was wild talk of hoisting the American flag and appealing to the United States for protection. The storm subsided with the final passage of the Reform Bill in Britain, for the planters then knew they had lost the battle to preserve slavery.

Nor was this all that they lost. Emancipation by act of Parliament was an exercise of imperial power that struck self-government in the West Indies a more crushing blow than any that had provoked the American Revolution. Yet no corresponding revolution followed, nor even an attempt at one, for the Caribbean colonies were helpless. They were individually too weak, collectively too scattered, and sociologically too unstable to think of forcible resistance by themselves; and they were geographically too cut off from the United States for them to think seriously of getting any outside aid. Had they lain as close as the British North American colonies to the great republic, there would probably have been a different story to tell.



Though emancipation did not produce a revolution, it brought on a political and constitutional crisis in the West Indies that, to the embarrassment of the home government, happened to coincide with the crisis in Canada. The strain that abolition imposed on the relations between the mother country and the colonies whose economy had rested on slave labour was aggravated by the colonial enactment and imperial disallowance of legislation touching negroes, and by the presence of the magistrates whom London introduced to protect the blacks. The feelings of these colonies toward London were very much like those of the Southern States toward Washington in the era of the Civil War, and London reciprocated.

The official protest of the Jamaican Assembly in 1838 reads like the envenomed charge of an oppressed nation against its oppressor. Parliament had "usurped the legitimate powers of the Assembly" with "monstrous pretexts" supported by "falsehoods and slander"; and was guilty "either of imbecility and cowardice," if yielding to popular pressure, "or of fraud and malice, and a thirst for omnipotent power, if the injustice was the result of deliberation and design." According to this hysterical document, Jamaica would never consent to be ruled by men who had failed to give England decent government, were responsible for Ireland's woes, and had just stirred up rebellion in Canada. The Assembly went on strike; and the home government, following its own recent precedent in dealing with Lower Canada, introduced into Parliament a bill to suspend the Jamaican constitution for five years. This threat, which was made only three months after the publication of Durham's *Report*, was not carried out. But the political troubles of the West Indies increased with their economic troubles, particularly after the British adoption of free trade; and the third quarter of the century saw Jamaica along with most of the other old British sugar colonies reduced to crown colony status.

The winning of self-government by the British North American colonies is a bright contrast to its contemporary decline and fall in the Caribbean colonies; and the legacy of slavery, which hung like a millstone round the neck of the latter, does not account for all the difference. The mere juxtaposition of the United States profoundly affected the constitutional struggle in British North America. The people living right next door in the former colonies were fully self-governing, and this ever present, contagious example greatly stimulated political discontent among their cousins in British North America. It could not be otherwise, particularly in that age of exuberant Jacksonian democracy. This is worth emphasizing because the British tradition in Canada and the rise of Canadian nationalism have since conspired to cover up the infection of British North America by Jacksonian democracy—just as nationalism in the United States has drawn a veil over the fact that Jacksonian democracy was an American expression of a general movement stirring in Western civilization.

The awakening of political democracy in British North America also derived some inspiration from contemporary developments in the Old World, especially from British radicalism; but the inspiration from across

the ocean was much less than that from across the border. Though immigrants from the mother country began to pour into British North America about 1825, the motives that impelled them were economic and social rather than political, and as a rule they became politically conscious only after they had spent a generation establishing themselves in the new land, by which time responsible government was already in operation. Yet it would be a mistake to suppose that the constitutional struggle in these colonies was chiefly the product of the Jacksonian ferment. The spirit of democracy was fostered by conditions that were North American, not just American in the narrow sense of the word; and as these British colonies approached what might be called the adolescent stage, the ancient traditions of political liberty that they had inherited from the mother country urged them to demand self-government.

That the constitutional struggle in British North America should become focused upon securing the cabinet system of government evolved in the mother country has been taken too much for granted. In French Canada, where the struggle broke out long before it did in any other part of British North America, the leaders knew enough about English constitutional history to draw from that armoury the old weapon of impeachment and the newer one of supply; and they cried out for an elected upper chamber, an American institution, in the belief that it would duplicate the Assembly instead of being a check upon it, a belief which was not American but just naïve. Why did they not go straight to the point and demand the adoption of the cabinet system? Why did not William Lyon Mackenzie do it, instead of becoming hypnotized by the American system with its election of the executive as well as of both houses of the legislature, its separation of powers, and its checks and balances? If there was less fumbling in the Maritime Provinces, this may be ascribed not to their superior intelligence but rather to the fact that they were slower to face the problem.

The real solution was first grasped in Upper Canada, by the Baldwins, and this was a remarkable feat when viewed in the light of developments in the mother country. As late as 1832 the House of Lords could and did claim to share with the House of Commons the right to control the Cabinet. Moreover the cabinet system, being an unconscious growth shaped by necessity rather than a conscious creation based on recognized principle, was little understood in England itself until long afterward. To quote Dicey: "Bagehot was the first author who explained in accordance with actual fact the true nature of the Cabinet and its real relation to the Crown and to Parliament. He is, in short, one of those rare teachers who have explained intricate matters with such complete clearness, as to make the public forget what is now so clear ever needed explanation." Bagehot's classic exposition, which came as such a revelation, was published in 1867. How, then, could colonials of the previous generation be expected to have such insight? Yet this is what they had.

A glance at another part of the British Empire—Ireland—throws into bold relief the unwitting influence of the United States in the concession of responsible government. When Grey became Colonial Secretary in



1846, he had imbibed the faith of his brother-in-law Durham, but the other members of the ministry apparently had not. They realized that continued resistance to the colonial demand would sooner or later drive the colonies into revolt, and that no imperial force could then hold them within the Empire because they lay too close to the United States. Haunted by the ghost of the American Revolution, these men believed that the colonies were destined to leave the Empire, and they preferred a peaceful and friendly parting to a violent and bitter one. Very different was their attitude toward Ireland, where a rising demand for self-government paralleled that of the British North American colonies.

On the morrow of O'Connell's triumph in 1829, he started the cry for the repeal of the Union, and in 1832 forty Irish members of the House of Commons were avowed Repealers. By 1840 the Irish leader was losing patience with the British government, and younger Irish politicians were losing patience with him and his moderate methods. Thereupon he revived his tactics of the twenties, organizing a Repeal Association on the model of his earlier Catholic Association, and its almost immediate success restored his ascendancy. In 1843 he seemed to be on the point of winning another great triumph for Ireland, when he planned a huge national demonstration that would impress Peel as he had once impressed Wellington. But Peel, unlike his predecessor, did not wait to be caught. He prohibited the meeting, sent troops to occupy the place where it was to be held, and dispatched ships to guard the Irish coast. This time it was O'Connell who was caught, for to go on with his plan meant committing himself and his followers to open rebellion. He called off the demonstration and thereby lost control of political agitation in Ireland, which then turned to violence as its only hope. It had recently done so in Lower and Upper Canada also, but the 1848 effort to stage a revolution in Ireland had a very different result. The hoped-for aid from France did not come. Ireland was crushed and helpless. No power, European or American, could do for Ireland what the United States had unconsciously done, and was still doing, for British North America.

It is also enlightening to the Canadian historian to look at what was happening in Australia in this period. When Grey took over the Colonial Office a deadlock between executive and legislature had been reached in Sydney, but he was not willing to make in Australia a surrender that seemed inevitable in America. The executive in New South Wales possessed a financial independence that had been lost in Canada, and there was no neighbouring United States on the other side of the world. In 1850 Grey fathered the important Australian Colonies Government Act, which extended representative government to the Australian colonies generally and permitted them to draft new constitutions for themselves. The Act evoked loud and bitter protests from New South Wales because it did not give responsible government. To the end of his term of office, Grey refused to yield the power of the purse to the Australian colonies, because he believed it would make them independent states. It was not until after the fall of his government that the principle of responsible government was conceded in Australia, to come into force with the

launching of the new constitutions. Meanwhile gold was transforming Australia, multiplying its population and democratizing its government.

The gold rush, which began in 1851, also produced Australia's only armed revolt. It occurred toward the end of 1854 in the mining camp of Ballarat over the exaction of a licence fee of thirty shillings a month from every digger. Determined to pay no longer, the miners made a grand bonfire of their licences; and, threatened by a "digger hunt" in which they would be ordered to show their licences, they stockaded themselves, hoisted a blue flag bearing the Southern Cross, proclaimed the Republic of Victoria, and took pot shots at a nearby military camp. Soldiers and police stormed the stockade, losing four men and killing thirty rebels. That was the end of the revolt, and of the hated licences.

But more interesting and significant was a peaceful preliminary to this rising. It was the formation of the Ballarat Reform League which, in addition to insisting on the withdrawal of the licences, demanded manhood suffrage, the abolition of property qualifications for members of the legislature, the payment of members, and frequent elections. It was no mere coincidence that these were four of the six reforms in the programme of the English Chartists. There is also a connection between the abortive Republic of Victoria and the pathetic attempt of 1848 to set up a republic in Ireland. The Ballarat insurgents were led by an Irishman and they included many other sturdy sons of Erin. Though the great majority of the immigrants came from the British Isles, they were no more a cross-section of the society that they left behind than were the British immigrants who built up British North America. These new Australians were largely representative of those sections of the population in their homeland whose spell of revolutionary fever, whether Chartist or Irish, had collapsed in 1848.

Political discontent strongly coloured the migration from the British Isles during these years. Then Irish republicanism took root and flourished in the United States, where the atmosphere was more congenial to it than in any of the British colonies. Chartism, on the other hand, was not anti-British, and what was left of it migrated to Australia. One may wonder why it did not turn up in British North America too, but the explanation is simple. Here democratic freedom was already established, whereas in Australia it was not.

By a coincidence that was quite fortuitous, the gold rush to Australia occurred at the very time when the Australian colonies were drafting their new constitutions, and the squatter aristocracy were using their control of the legislatures to perpetuate their own political power. It was a crucial turning-point in the history of the continent. The constitutions that emerged from the squatter mould had no time to harden before the lure of gold swamped the country with a population that was strongly imbued with Chartist principles. The introduction of this democratic force quickly altered the shape of the new constitutions. By 1890 all the Australian colonies had enacted most of the Chartist programme.

Another Australian contrast that deserves Canadian attention was the attempt of the Australians to launch responsible government with a



statutory definition of the distinction between reserved imperial powers and transferred colonial powers. This question had not been raised when the British North American colonies achieved responsible government, for they were then not concerned with preparing written constitutions and there was no need to discuss the issue. But the first draft constitutions that London received from Australia all contained clauses that would divide sovereignty and make the colonial legislatures absolutely supreme in their own spheres. The Colonial Office was inclined to accept these clauses and to have Parliament adopt the drafts as they stood. It was not until the law officers of the Crown pointed out that such parliamentary action would mean "a total abandonment by the Home Government of any right to interfere directly or indirectly with any colonial legislation whatever, except within the narrow circle" of the reserved imperial powers, that the Colonial Office drew back and decided that the novel clauses must go. These clauses would have inserted into the constitutional relations between the colonies and the mother country a legal rigidity that would have cramped the growth of colonial autonomy, which was then conceived quite narrowly. The adverse decision, in which the Australians acquiesced, was made in the interests of the imperial government, but it operated in favour of colonial governments generally.

It should also be interesting to students of Canadian development to observe that, shortly after the gold rush, Australian society became set in a pattern very different from that of contemporary North America. The swollen population of the gold fields shrank in the late fifties, as the surface deposits were being worked out. The stranded diggers turned to make a living by tilling the soil. But when they looked around for land, they found that most of it was locked up by leases held by the squatters, the big ranchers. Then began a powerful political drive to throw open the land for agricultural settlement on such easy terms that any man might there establish his own independence—as on this continent. The squatters lost the initial round of the battle over the land because they had lost the political battle of the fifties. Democratic legislation overrode their leases and gave anyone who wanted to farm the right to select his own land.

This legislation precipitated a conflict similar to that which was later fought between the cattlemen and the dirt farmers of the semi-arid American West. There seems to have been less violence but more fraud in the Australian struggle. The fraud was notorious, and the government did little or nothing to check it, because too many people were interested in it. Strangers wandered at will over squatters' holdings and picked choice patches, the selection of which would ruin flock-masters by depriving sheep of access to scarce water. Too often the intruders did it merely to force the squatters to buy them out. To checkmate this racket, known as "peacocking," and also to defeat honest selectors, the squatters developed a racket of their own, called "dummying," which turned the selection laws upside down. Using hired dummies as well as their own families, including two-year-old children, the squatters picked the eyes of their own runs and thus acquired outright ownership of the vital parts



of their own holdings. The impetus of the struggle also carried many squatters on to take advantage of an earlier law that permitted them to purchase what they were renting from the government. So it came to pass that the land was locked up more securely than ever.

The price of the ultimate squatter victory was heavy. As the contest dragged on through the sixties and seventies, the pastoral industry had to pay out a great deal of cash in order to buy security, which meant that it had to find much additional capital. This the banks supplied, and, as a result, the industry emerged with a debt that has burdened it to our own day. Another legacy of those unhappy years was the practical exclusion from public life of the most substantial class of men in the country.

Australia has missed the balancing influence that the small independent farmer gave to society on this continent. The population of Australia, unlike that of North America, has been predominantly urban since the early sixties. The failure to spread the people over the land forced the development of native manufactures for domestic consumption. Thus the cleavage between labour and capital was much more pronounced in Australia than in North America. Even farming was more capitalist, while the grazing, mining, and manufacturing industries were wholly capitalist. The average Australian was not his own economic boss. He was a wage-earner, like the average native of Britain, whence he had recently come. It was therefore doubly natural that the labour movement of the mother country should project itself bodily into Australian society. Before the gold rush there was very little trade unionism in Australia. When the rush subsided there was much of it.

The reason for this Australian pattern of life lies deeper than any squatter villainy or governmental laxity, and it may teach us a wholesome lesson in humility, with which I shall close these rambling remarks. Even the strictest enforcement of the conditions that the selection laws prescribed could not have made Australia a land of democratic agriculture. Heaven had decreed otherwise, by withholding the necessary rainfall. What the squatters prevented was really an attempt to break up their great pastoral estates for the sake of planting a few small farmers on the occasional pieces that could grow crops, which would have been more wasteful than the extravagant slaughter of the buffalo on our plains for the sake of their delicious tongues. It was not for lack of trying that Australians failed to build a society founded on democratic agriculture. Our forbears, on the other hand, did it almost unconsciously. They could hardly help it, sharing as they did in the development of the largest and richest and solidest agricultural region of the world. A little knowledge of contrasting Australian experience thus brings out the fact that the pattern of life which we inherited, and which has been a source of no little pride, was shaped more by nature and less by man than we have been wont to admit.

## THE QUEEN'S RANGERS AND THEIR CONTRIBUTION IN THE YEARS 1776 TO 1784

Lieutenant Colonel H. M. JACKSON, M.B.E., E.D.

*Department of Veterans Affairs*

FACED with the need for waging war against the type of fighter developed by the French and their Indian allies in the Seven Years' War, the New England settlers evolved a corps whose hardiness, toughness, and skill against their opponents have been bywords ever since. This corps was Rogers' Rangers, the predecessors of the unit with which this paper is concerned, the Queen's Rangers.

The first Rangers raised by Robert Rogers in 1756 comprised one company, 65 strong.<sup>1</sup> They were drawn from a band of scouts who served with Rogers under Sir William Johnson the preceding year. Rogers' Rangers have been termed the eyes and ears of the army, and likened to Sir John Moore's Light Brigade. Among their more important duties were those of securing and conveying intelligence, serving as guides, protecting convoys through leagues of forest and exposed waterways, harassing the enemy, frequently taking prisoners in the very teeth of their antagonist, and engaging him wherever they found him. Although they were often in action in the Seven Years' War, fighting was not the most important of their duties. Their chief function was undoubtedly procuring intelligence. When the armies of both sides went into winter quarters, the Rangers were just as active as though the watercourses were open, and their use of "skaits" and snowshoes has been repeated recently in the training carried on for the invasion of Norway in 1940. It was essential that the commanders should have information of the activities of the enemy and this the Rangers provided. In actual combat the Rangers were generally posted as or with the advance-guard; in a withdrawal as or with the rear-guard. They were at both sieges of Fort William Henry, at the capture of Louisbourg, and at Ste. Foy; and in 1760 when the three British armies converged on Montreal, some of the then eleven companies accompanied each army, Rogers leading the advance up Lake Champlain. When the war ended the Rangers were disbanded and Rogers, after a chequered career as commandant of Michilimackinac and inmate of a debtors' jail, settled down with his memories and his bottles until the outbreak of fighting in America brought him out of obscurity.

Rogers returned to America in the summer of 1775. As a retired officer on half pay, he was regarded by the Americans with suspicion, if not as a spy. Hence he was arrested by order of Congress, but shortly afterwards was released on parole. He told Washington that he desired to settle his private affairs<sup>2</sup> and was interested in the acquisition of lands, and there is documentary proof of this; but he was arrested again late

<sup>1</sup>Authorized by William Shirley, Commander in Chief of the British forces in America, March 23, 1756.

<sup>2</sup>P. Force, *American Archives*, 4th Series (Washington, 1843), IV, 266, Rogers to Washington, Dec. 14, 1775.



in June, 1776, on Washington's orders.<sup>3</sup> Considering that this relieved him of adhering to his parole, he escaped<sup>4</sup> and openly espoused the Loyalist cause. On August 6, 1776, he was commissioned by General Sir William Howe as lieutenant colonel commandant and ordered to raise a provincial corps, the Queen's Rangers.<sup>5</sup>

This paper will not attempt to tell the complete story of the Queen's Rangers in the Revolutionary War, but will mention three types of operation in which they were frequently engaged: the pitched battle, in which they participated with the army; the foray, of which there are numerous examples; and the engagement fought almost exclusively by the regiment.

Before the end of the war, the Queen's Rangers consisted of eleven companies of foot, including a grenadier company, riflemen, light infantrymen, and a highland company wearing the MacNab tartan; troops of dragoons and hussars; and some guns.<sup>6</sup> Rogers's command was relatively short lived. He suffered a defeat at Marmaroneck in the operations about New York when his command of approximately 100 men was surprised by 750 of the Americans.<sup>7</sup> He was succeeded in February, 1777 by Lieutenant Colonel French, and the latter was followed in May, 1777 by Major James Wemyss. Under the latter the regiment formed part of General Howe's army in its advance against Philadelphia.

At the battle of Brandywine Creek in the operations preceding the capture of Philadelphia,<sup>8</sup> as part of General Knyphausen's division, the Queen's Rangers, attacking the American left at Chad's Ford, broke and dispersed both Waggoner's and Porterfield's brigades, resulting in the withdrawal of Wayne's division.<sup>9</sup> The victory at Brandywine cost the

<sup>3</sup>Jared Sparks, *The Writings of George Washington* (Boston, 1833-7), III, 400.

<sup>4</sup>Force, *American Archives*, 5th Series (1848), I, 33, 136.

<sup>5</sup>Sparks, *Washington*, IV, 520; E. B. O'Callaghan (ed.), *Colonial History of New York* (Albany, 1856), VIII, 687, Governor Tryon to George Germain, Sept. 27, 1776; Lorenzo Sabine, *The American Loyalists* (Boston, 1847), 576; (1864), II, 233.

<sup>6</sup>Alexander J. Wall (ed.), *Uniforms of the American, British, French and German Armies in the War of the American Revolution, 1775-1783* (New York Historical Society, 1926); paintings and descriptions by the late Charles M. Lefferts.

<sup>7</sup>Sparks, *Washington*, IV, Appendix. Rogers's career was not yet finished, for on May 1, 1778, he was authorized by Sir Henry Clinton to raise a new regiment of two battalions. Under his brother, Major James Rogers, this unit, the King's Rangers, served in Quebec with headquarters at St. John (one battalion only), and played its part in keeping the Lake Champlain route of invasion into Canada closed and in securing intelligence. In addition, James Rogers and several of his officers took part in the "Vermont Negotiations." (Public Archives of Canada, Haldimand Papers, B 213 (B.M. 21, 873); B 54 (B.M. 21, 820).) Vol. B 160 is entirely devoted to correspondence concerning this unit, about which the writer has been unable to find anything in print. Other volumes in this series also containing relevant material are: B 63, 149, 150, 161, 162, 166, 167, 177-1, 184-2, 190, and 230 to 232.

Of the King's Rangers, 120 officers and other ranks, 47 women, 118 children, and 14 servants (288 in all), settled in Township No. 3, Cataraqui. ("General Abstract of Men, Women, and Children settled on the New Townships on the River St. Lawrence, etc.," Haldimand Papers, B 168 (B.M. 21, 828).)

<sup>8</sup>W. C. Ford, *The Writings of George Washington* (New York, 1890), VI, 67, Washington to Congress, Sept. 9, 1777.

<sup>9</sup>H. B. Carrington, *Battles of the American Revolution* (New York, 1876; re-issued, New York, 1877).

Rangers a fifth of the entire British casualties, 72 killed and wounded, including 14 of the 21 officers.<sup>10</sup> "I must be silent as to the behaviour of the Rangers," said Knyphausen in writing of the conduct of the unit, "for I want words to express my own astonishment, and to give an idea of it."<sup>11</sup>

As a recognition of their conduct in this action, General Howe issued an order that all future promotions should "go through the unit." It was also granted the right of being the only provincial regiment which could enlist Old Countrymen and deserters from the enemy, a measure which resulted in the nationality of the personnel gradually changing from entirely American to largely European. It should be kept in mind, however, that it was the original Loyalists who constituted the source from which the regiment took its *esprit de corps* and discipline, for these men served from conviction and in defence of their homes, and they were proscribed for their attachment to the Crown.

Further casualties were suffered in the ensuing battle of Germantown;<sup>12</sup> the Queen's Rangers took part in the final attack which routed the American forces. Among the wounded was Major Wemyss. On October 15, Captain John Graves Simcoe of the 40th Foot was appointed to command with the provincial rank of major. By the end of that month the regiment consisted of the eleven companies of foot mentioned, plus a mounted division. A three-pounder gun was added early the following year. On May 2, 1779, a general order was issued<sup>13</sup> which gave the unit its subsequent designation, "First American Regiment."<sup>14</sup>

<sup>10</sup>W. O. Raymond, "Loyalists in Arms" (*New Brunswick Historical Collections*, II, 1904, 202); Muster Rolls, Nov. 24, 1777, in James Hannay, "History of the Queen's Rangers" (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd Series, II, Section II, 1908, 133-7).

<sup>11</sup>General Orders had the following to say on Sept. 13, two days after the engagement: "The Commander-in-Chief desires to convey to the officers and men of The Queen's Rangers his approbation and acknowledgement for their spirited and gallant conduct in the engagement of the 11th instant, and to assure them how well he is satisfied with their distinguished conduct on that day. His Excellency only regrets their having suffered so much in the gallant execution of their duty."

<sup>12</sup>The regimental Muster Rolls of Nov. 24, 1777, for the previous three months, show total casualties of 139, including 24 killed in action or dead of wounds, but many wounded at Brandywine had since reported for duty, so are not included.

<sup>13</sup>"That His Majesty, anxious to reward their faithful service and spirited conduct, on several occasions, had been pleased to confer upon them the following marks of His Royal favour—. That the officers of the Provincial Corps shall rank as juniors of the rank to which they belong, and if disabled in service, shall be entitled to the same gratuity as officers of the established army; and, to distinguish the zeal of such Regiments as shall be complete, His Majesty will, upon recommendation of the Commander-in-Chief, make the rank of those officers permanent in America, and will allow them half-pay, on the reduction of their Regiments in the same manner as officers of British reduced Regiments are paid." In consequence of this order, and with the approval of the King, the regiment was styled and numbered "The First American Regiment."

<sup>14</sup>Of the fifty or more provincial units, four others were honoured in the same manner. The Volunteers of Ireland, later absorbed in the regular army as the 105th Regiment of Foot, now the 2nd Battalion of the King's Own Yorkshire Light Infantry, became the 2nd American Regiment; the New York Volunteers the 3rd; the British Legion the 4th, and the King's American Regiment the 5th.



On assuming command Simcoe had the opportunity of putting some of his own ideas into effect. Considering that a light corps such as his, constantly employed in the outposts of the army, had little opportunity of absorbing instruction, he concentrated on teaching the men the necessity for eternal vigilance, activity, and patience under fatigue. He believed that only a few of the manual exercises were necessary, but insisted upon the most rigorous instruction in musketry, and even more attention to the use of the bayonet in order to inculcate complete confidence in that weapon. The custom of "sizing" companies was not followed, but it was directed that two files in the centre and two on each flank of a company consist of seasoned soldiers. While a roster of duties was not maintained, it became the practice that the selection of an officer for any duty was based upon his ability to discharge it. It was likewise established that the relative precedence of a duty was not to be measured by the numbers employed upon it, but by its own importance in relation to the existing circumstances. Sergeants' guards were eliminated, and every guard was placed under command of an officer, to which fact Simcoe attributed the fact that no sentry or guard of the regiment was ever surprised.

As a corps formed during active service cannot acquire the habits of strict discipline as easily as in times of peace, the inculcation of discipline and steadiness and the perfection of the interior economy of the unit were made of first importance. It was stressed that, as regularity in messing and cleanliness in every respect tended to the health of the soldier, the commanding officer would base his estimate of the capacity of an officer on his attention to these details. Written orders were avoided wherever possible, a practice reminiscent of that of the Second World War, but daily after parade the officers met and received their orders verbally. All written orders were, however, read to the men on company parades. It was as a result of Simcoe's efforts that the Queen's Rangers as a unit came to possess that quality so essential yet difficult of achievement for any military body, cohesion. Like the *arme blanche* of the cavalry, where rider, horse, and sword become one weapon, the Rangers were trained to act so as to carry out the orders of their commander in a thoroughly integrated manner.

While the Rangers were stationed at Richmond on Staten Island in October, 1779, word came that the Americans had gathered a large number of boats on carriages at Middlebrook on the Raritan, New Jersey, for use in a projected attack on New York. Simcoe suggested a plan to destroy them and after consultation with Lord Cornwallis, Sir Henry Clinton ordered that the scheme be put into operation, although the intervening country was alive with Jersey militia and its inhabitants were solid supporters of independence. In addition, Colonel W. H. Lee, the American cavalry commander, was nearby. At 8 P.M. on October 25, the troops, consisting of 300 infantrymen, the regimental artillery, and cavalry including the Bucks' County Light Dragoons under Captain Sandford and some Staten Island Mounted Militia under Lieutenant Stuart, marched



from Richmond for Billing's Point, and thence proceeded by boat to the Jersey shore.

At Perth Amboy Simcoe explained to the officers the operation and his plan for the various portions of his detachment. He intended to march with the cavalry to Middlebrook by the shortest route, to destroy the boats, and moving up the Millstone River to Hillsborough, to cross and return by New Brunswick, circling to avoid the town. When he reached the heights east of New Brunswick, he planned to draw the enemy into an ambush prepared by the Ranger infantry close by South River bridge. Directly the cavalry moved off, Major Armstrong, with the infantry and artillery, was instructed to proceed with the greatest secrecy and speed to South River bridge, seven miles from Perth Amboy, prepare his ambush, and await Simcoe's return with the cavalry. For the identification of runners, the countersign was "Clinton and Montrose."

The first object, that of the destruction of the boats, was achieved, but unfortunately only eighteen of the boats had been left at Middlebrook. The second object, that of arousing the country, was accomplished on the return journey. In a skirmish with American troops near New Brunswick, Simcoe's horse was killed, and he was captured.<sup>15</sup> But the American cavalry was dispersed, the infantry thrust back, and the Rangers' cavalry detachment reached South River bridge at four. Here the Americans were scattered by Armstrong's party, already in position, and by evening the united force had returned to Richmond.

With only one brief halt for a meal, the Ranger cavalry had covered more than eighty miles in enemy country that day, avoiding his troops wherever possible, or dispersing them; while the Ranger infantry had marched thirty miles during a night and a day.<sup>16</sup> Admittedly they had lost their commanding officer but he subsequently returned to the Queen's Rangers on exchange. Much more had been accomplished than the destruction of a few boats and the capture of prisoners. The exploits of the Rangers caused alarm throughout the country. General Anthony Wayne was detached from Washington's army in the highlands and marched with his division of light troops fourteen miles that night, and thirty the ensuing day, in an attempt to cut off the raiders. In Monmouth County, Colonel Lee also tried to intercept them, without success. The fact that the Queen's Rangers could thus sweep through enemy country

<sup>15</sup>Rivington's *New York Gazette*, Nov. 3, 1779.

<sup>16</sup>In his memoirs of the war, Colonel W. H. Lee says that this enterprise was considered by both armies "among the handsomest exploits of the war. Simcoe executed completely his objective then deemed most important: . . . What is very extraordinary, Lieut.-Col. Simcoe being obliged to feed once during the night, stopped at a depot of forage collected by the Continental Army, assumed the character of Lee's cavalry, waked up the Commissary about midnight, drew the customary amount of forage, and gave the usual vouchers, signing the name of the legion Quartermaster without being discovered by the American commissary or his assistants. The dress of both corps was the same, green coatees and leather breeches; yet the success of the strategem is astonishing." (Appendix to *Simcoe's Military Journal* (New York, 1844), 324-5, a quotation from Lee's *Memoirs of the War*.)

at will, brushing aside or overcoming all opposition, illustrates the high state of efficiency of the Queen's Rangers and the lack of it among the rebels. It also shows that while time, geography, and general strategy were on the side of the Americans, the British were masters of tactics and of the fighting generally.

After fighting in the Carolinas and Virginias in 1780-1, in June of the latter year the regiment found itself with a strength of 447 infantry and 163 cavalry, a total of 610, excluding the cavalry in South Carolina. Acting as rear-guard of the army in Virginia on the march to Williamsburg, the Queen's Rangers, on June 26, fought an action at Spencer's Ordinary, near the junction of the Jamestown and Williamsburg roads. At this point the infantry was awaiting the arrival of the cavalry, which had been engaged in the collection of cattle in the neighbourhood. Suddenly a shot rang out from the sentries of the highland company, and galloping towards a wood on the left, Simcoe reached high ground in time to observe Captain Shank and the cavalry moving swiftly forward in close pursuit of the enemy cavalry. Shank broke them completely, so that they did not again appear on the field.

At this moment, however, the American infantry arrived and the fight grew hotter. Simcoe ordered up the Ranger infantry, less one company; the light company with Captain Ewald's detachment of Yagers was commanded to move directly to its front and to occupy a wood on the right, while the riflemen moved to the left in order to relieve the cavalry and to hold the enemy in check there. Information was then sent to Cornwallis that the Americans were in force and that Lafayette, Wayne, and Steuben were not far distant. As yet only the American advance-guard commanded by Colonel Butler was actively engaged, but Wayne's main body was close behind.<sup>17</sup> Under cover of the protection afforded by the Ranger infantry as it extended to the right and advanced toward a ridge and woods in front, the cavalry withdrew to the Jamestown Road, near which it formed a mobile reserve ready to help the infantry on the left or Ewald on the right. Covered by the highland company, the three-pounder was posted so as to sweep the roadway. An attempt by American infantry to turn the British left was defeated by a charge of Shank's cavalry. Meanwhile the Ranger infantry drove the Americans from the fences and woods in front, and Ewald and his Yagers turned their left. Shank then led his cavalry through the enemy columns and fought his way back. Captain McGill's grenadier company suffered severe casualties, while Captain Stevenson's light infantrymen were obstinately opposed but carried all before them, although losing one-quarter of their strength. On the 28th, Army Orders contained encomiums of the conduct of the unit in this action.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup>*Simcoe's Military Journal*, 229.

<sup>18</sup>"Lord Cornwallis desires Lieut.-Col. Simcoe will accept his warmest acknowledgements for his spirited and judicious conduct in the action of the 26th instant, when he repulsed and defeated a superior force of the enemy. He likewise desires that Lieut.-Col. Simcoe will communicate his thanks to the officers and soldiers of The Queen's Rangers and to Capt. Ewald and the detachment of the Yagers."



When it was known that Cornwallis's army, blockaded in Yorktown, had no choice but surrender, Simcoe volunteered to fight his way out with his regiment, not because he had any desire to add to its laurels, but because Loyalist members had been previously roughly handled when captured by the rebels. He was informed that the Queen's Rangers must abide by the fate of the rest of the army. Their colours were not, however, surrendered. They remained in the hands of the Simcoe family for more than one hundred years, until the estate was sold in 1923. They were then bought by Mr. F. B. Robbins and presented to the city of Toronto, where they are on display in the Reference Library.

The strength of the regiment at the surrender at Yorktown, as shown by the return of October 25, was 47 officers and 556 other ranks, exclusive of Captain Saunders's troop of dragoons, who in Virginia and South Carolina rendered many valuable services.<sup>19</sup> In addition, the following casualties are recorded among the other ranks in the Yorktown operations: killed, 28; died of wounds, 1; missing, 30. Simcoe was allowed to sail for England shortly after his arrival in New York. Representations to His Majesty succeeded in making the rank of the officers, hitherto held only in the scene of action, universally permanent on December 25, 1782, and the Queen's Rangers, 1st American Regiment, were enrolled as a regular unit of the British Army.<sup>20</sup>

Since it was decided that disbanded Loyalist regiments should be settled in Nova Scotia on Crown lands, Major Armstrong made a return in April, 1783, showing that provision should be made for land grants to a total of 575 all ranks, apart from those who did not desire settlement, those who had sailed for England, and others on leave in America. On October 13, the Queen's Rangers were disbanded at Saint John. The men received grants of land in York County,<sup>21</sup> particularly in the parish of Queensbury which was named after the regiment: and the officers went on half pay. In peace-time, in a new country, the former officers of the regiment gave as good service as they had in war. Simcoe, of course, displayed his qualities as head of the new province of Upper Canada. Of his officers, one served twice as administrator of a province, one as a member of an Executive Council, six as members of Legislative Assemblies, four as provincial administrative officers, two as judges, three as magistrates or justices of the peace, one as adjutant-general in 1812, one as a general in the British Army, one as a lieutenant general, one as a major general, one as a colonel in the British Army, and one as a colonel of militia. This takes no account of many others who served their new provinces in minor capacities, both civil and military.

It is evident from the few examples given that the Queen's Rangers of the Revolutionary War period deserve the description of the American

<sup>19</sup>Muster Rolls, Oct. 24, 1781. See Hannay, "History of the Queen's Rangers," 166-76.

<sup>20</sup>War Office, Sir George Yonge to Simcoe, Jan. 21, 1783, and Army List.

<sup>21</sup>A return of Sept. 25, 1784, by Thos. Knox, shows that 210 men, 64 women, 64 children, and 23 servants of the regiment settled in the province, the largest body of Loyalist soldiery to do so.



General Lee: that they were the most efficient single unit on either side. Their discipline, *esprit de corps*, and fighting efficiency were proverbial. They proved the efficacy of long years of training and discipline. In no war has the British higher command ever been worse; in few wars has junior leadership been better. During the American Revolutionary War a number of brilliant junior officers emerged, among them Simcoe. It is a nice question whether, had such men as Simcoe and Tarleton been in more senior appointments, the course of the War of Independence might have been different.

It is especially significant that like Robert Rogers with his famous "Plan of Discipline" or system of tactics in the Seven Years' War, Simcoe had a scheme of training and of fighting which he had determined to try with colonial troops before obtaining his own command.<sup>22</sup> This plan he used with the Queen's Rangers, and its effect is a matter of record. The result was regimental efficiency and such effectiveness that there is a great, and almost an entire, absence of those blunders and errors which may be expected in actual warfare. It was achieved not only because Simcoe sought that type of command and was a military enthusiast, but also because of his upbringing and character. In his administration of Upper Canada in later years, he showed the same qualities as in his Revolutionary War command and his ideas for betterment of the new province were only extensions of those he evolved and used with his Rangers.

The Revolution as a whole is an object lesson proving that it is useless to win battles when the general strategy is poorly planned. The Queen's Rangers and other units like them might perform prodigies of valour and win tactical victories almost without number as long as the fighting lasted, but their efforts were largely stultified by the incredible stupidity of the over-all planning. And incidentally the career of this regiment during the American Revolution is only one more proof that, given good leadership and training, the citizen soldier makes as good a fighting man as can be found anywhere in the world.<sup>23</sup>

#### APPENDIX

*A partial record of the careers of some of Simcoe's officers after the Revolutionary War.*

Agnew, Rev. John, D.D. Member of the Legislative Assembly for Sunbury.

Agnew, Stair. Son of John. For more than 25 years the member for York in the New Brunswick Legislative Assembly.

Allen, Adam. Settled in Saint John, N.B. Poet; author of a poetical description of the Great Falls of the River St. John.

<sup>22</sup>"He was a man of letters and like the Romans and Grecians cultivated science amid the turmoil of camp. He was enterprising, resolute and persevering; weighing well his project before entered upon, and promptly seizing every advantage which offered itself in the course of execution." (Lee, *Memoirs*, quoted in Appendix to *Simcoe's Military Journal*, 323.)

<sup>23</sup>The discussion which followed this paper appears on page 40 at the end of the paper given by Sam H. S. Hughes in the same session.

Armstrong, Richard. In command after Yorktown until disbandment. A magistrate in New Brunswick, Lieutenant Colonel in York County Militia and finally Lieutenant General in British Army.

Grimes, John Randolph. Agent for the prosecution of Royalist claims to Virginia estates.

Jarvis, William. First Secretary of Upper Canada.

McGill, John. First settled in New Brunswick. Rejoined the regiment on its reorganization in 1791. In 1793, Commissioner of Stores, Upper Canada; in 1805 Inspector-General of Accounts, and in 1818 Receiver-General. Member of Legislative Assembly.

McKay, Hugh. Member of the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick for Charlotte County for more than 30 years from 1792. Colonel of Militia (the only "full" Colonel in the province). Senior Justice of Court of Common Pleas for Charlotte County.

McLeod, John. Afterwards General Sir John, G.C.B.

MacNab, Allan. Sergeant-at-Arms of the Upper Canadian Assembly, father of Sir Allan MacNab.

Merritt, Thomas. Raised and commanded the Niagara Dragoons in the War of 1812. His son was the projector of the first Welland Canal.

Moorehouse, Daniel. Magistrate and Major of Militia, Queensbury County, N.B.

Ormond, George. Settled in New Brunswick in 1783.

Robinson, Christopher. Called to the bar and practised law in Kingston. Deputy Ranger of His Majesty's Woods and Forests, Upper Canada. Benchler of the Law Society and member of the House of Assembly for Lennox and Addington.

Saunders, John. In 1790 succeeded Judge Putnam on the Supreme Court of New Brunswick.

Shank, David. Re-entered the active list when the regiment was reorganized in 1791 for service in Upper Canada. In 1796 on Simcoe's return to England, he assumed command of the troops in Upper Canada. In 1803 appointed to command the Canadian Fencibles; Colonel, 1808; Major General, 1811, and Lieutenant General, 1821.

Shaw, Aeneas. On the reorganization of the regiment in 1791 he marched a detachment from Fredericton, N.B., to Montreal on snowshoes in the winter. In July, 1793, with 100 of the Queen's Rangers, began the first clearing of the present city of Toronto. Member of Legislative Assembly of Upper Canada, 1793. Lieutenant Colonel in the Army, 1791. Placed in command of the First Division of Militia by Major General Brock in 1812 as Colonel. Appointed Adjutant General April 29, 1812, with rank of major general.

Smith, Samuel. Settled in New Brunswick at the peace, but went to England and the Continent, accompanied the reorganized regiment to Upper Canada. In command 1796-8. Member of Executive Council of Upper Canada in 1815, and Administrator for 14 months between the terms of Governors Gore and Maitland, and again later.

Spencer, George. Deputy Quartermaster General, accompanying Simcoe to Upper Canada.

Whitlock, John. In 1791 a Lieutenant Colonel of Queen's County, N.B., Militia and a justice of the peace.

## HABITS GRIS ET CHEMISE ROUGE

Le major LÉOPOLD LAMONTAGNE  
*Collège militaire royal, Kingston*

LE CANADA, en moins de cent ans, a participé en hommes, en dollars et en matériel à quatre conflits armés outre-mer. La première expédition remonte au lendemain de la Confédération, alors que plus de cinq cents sujets canadiens de Sa Majesté la reine Victoria, autorité suprême de l'Eglise d'Angleterre, sont allés défendre les Etats du pape Pie IX, chef spirituel de l'Eglise catholique. Ce fut une campagne peu sanglante mais fort retentissante, peut-être pas très glorieuse mais certainement curieuse à plus d'un égard.

Depuis 1859, Victor-Emmanuel, Cavour et Garibaldi travaillent à conquérir l'Italie. Garibaldi apporte pour sa part la Sicile et le royaume de Naples. Le roi de Sardaigne-Piémont reçoit en cadeau la Lombardie et il annexe l'Italie centrale, puis la Marche et l'Ombrie, enlevées au pape après la bataille de Castelfidardo. Cette défaite qui met en deuil tous les cœurs catholiques éveille un premier écho en terre canadienne; elle fait vibrer la lyre de notre barde national, Octave Crémazie, qui chante la gloire des Zouaves belges et français de Lamoricière :

... ces cœurs pleins de foi qui donnèrent leur vie  
Pour le droit et pour Dieu<sup>1</sup>.

### L'AVANT-GARDE

Or, à cette époque, vivent à Paris quelques étudiants canadiens qui s'intéressent de près à la révolution italienne et qui ne partagent pas les mêmes idées à cet égard. C'est ainsi que nos premiers combattants s'enrôlent à Paris, comme des frères ennemis, en deux camps adverses. L'un, Arthur Buies<sup>2</sup>, étudiant au Lycée Saint-Louis, endosse la chemise rouge des Garibaldiens en juin 1860 et part pour la Sicile nouvellement conquise. L'autre, Benjamin Antoine Testard de Montigny<sup>3</sup>, jeune avocat de Montréal en stage d'études dans la Ville Lumière, revêt la tenue grise des soldats du Pape le 15 janvier 1861. Spectacle étonnant que de voir ces deux hommes de vingt ans, catholiques de naissance, se distinguer d'une si différente façon. Le premier a été mis à la porte de trois collèges canadiens, il s'est échappé d'un quatrième à Dublin et il vient de manquer son baccalauréat au cinquième, à Paris. Le second, élève modèle au seul collège de Joliette, puis avocat au barreau de Montréal, a toujours fait la consolation de ses maîtres. Buies fut aussi avocat et, par surcroît, membre le plus actif et le plus libéral de l'Institut canadien, jusqu'à en devenir le secrétaire. De Montigny fut élu président de l'organisme rival, fondé par

<sup>1</sup>Octave Crémazie, *Oeuvres complètes* (Montréal, 1882), 196.

<sup>2</sup>Arthur Buies, homme de lettres, né à Montréal en 1840, mort à Québec en 1901.

<sup>3</sup>B. A. T. de Montigny, magistrat et écrivain. Né à Saint-Jérôme (Qué.) en 1838, mort à Montréal en 1899.



l'Evêché : l'Institut canadien-français. L'un écrit l'éloge de Garibaldi, l'autre est l'un des fondateurs du comité des Zouaves canadiens et plus tard président de l'Amicale des anciens Zouaves. L'un fonde la *Lanterne*, journal anticlérical, ultralibéral et presque révolutionnaire; l'autre, le *Franco-Parleur*, hebdomadaire ultramontain et conservateur. Deux types très attachants qui, par des voies si diverses, pour ne pas dire contraires, ont fini par se rejoindre dans le vaste sein du curé Labelle, le roi du Nord, et devenir, enfin d'accord, deux zéloteurs de la colonisation.

Mais, pour une chemise rouge, il y eut plusieurs centaines d'habits gris. Au début, toutefois, l'enrôlement est bien équilibré : un garibaldien, un pontifical; un Canadien-français, un Irlandais. En effet, Hugh Murray<sup>4</sup>, qui a abandonné ses études de médecine pour entrer à la rédaction du *Journal of Education*, retrouve de Montigny à Rome en juillet 1861. La troisième recrue, qui se fait attendre six ans, s'enrôle aussi à l'étranger et, cette fois, pour fins de diversité, en Angleterre. Il s'agit d'Alfred Larocque, jeune homme appartenant à une riche famille de Montréal, qui vient de terminer ses études au Collège de Stonyhurst<sup>5</sup>. Il va rejoindre Murray en février 1867. Tous deux prennent part à la bataille de Mentana le 3 novembre de la même année. Larocque y reçoit deux balles, l'une dans la bouche et l'autre dans l'épaule. Le sergent Murray qui commande une demi-compagnie est blessé au bras droit<sup>6</sup>.

Après cette victoire papale où le sang canadien a coulé, il y eut encore quelques départs isolés<sup>7</sup>; mais, jusqu'ici, pas d'effort concerté dans le domaine du recrutement. Aucun mot d'ordre n'est encore venu de la hiérarchie religieuse.

#### LA CAMPAGNE DE RECRUTEMENT

Il appartenait à l'ordinaire de Montréal, Mgr Ignace Bourget, le plus romain de tous les évêques canadiens, d'inaugurer la campagne de recrutement. Il le fait d'abord sans grand appareil, dans une petite annonce lue dans la cathédrale de Montréal le 17 novembre 1867 et reproduite dans la presse le lendemain. Il recommande Larocque aux prières, puis il souligne l'honneur que le blessé de Mentana fait rejaillir sur sa ville et sur son pays. Il rappelle ensuite les demandes de nombreux jeunes gens qui veulent secourir Pie IX. Et il ajoute : « Il est à croire que... il y a dans notre jeune Canada... assez de richesses pour équiper un bataillon canadien »<sup>8</sup>. L'évêque de Montréal, sous le prétexte d'une recommanda-

<sup>4</sup>Hugh Murray, né à Montréal en 1836. Sa famille déménage à Québec la même année. Il obtient son B.A. en 1856. Neveu de Mgr Horan, évêque de Kingston.

<sup>5</sup>Collège catholique du Lancashire, Angleterre.

<sup>6</sup>*London Weekly Register*, 15 décembre 1867, cité dans E. L. de Bellefeuille, *Le Canada et les Zouaves pontificaux* (Montréal, 1868), 10-13.

<sup>7</sup>Mentionnons, en janvier 1868 : Wilfrid Prendergast, avocat; Gédéon Désilets, étudiant en notariat et Gaspard Hainault, étudiant en médecine qui, pour défrayer les dépenses de voyage, vendent même leurs livres, des hardes et d'autres objets, tant était vif leur désir de partir; en février : Alphonse Têtu et Napoléon Courteau de Québec; en mars, Gustave Drolet, avocat.

<sup>8</sup>*Mandements, lettres pastorales, circulaires et autres documents publiés dans le diocèse de Montréal, depuis son érection* (Montréal, 1869-1919), V, 270 et suiv.

tion aux prières, non seulement laisse percer ses vues mais il indique un programme très précis de recrutement « équiper un bataillon canadien ».

C'est un prône d'une extrême habileté oratoire mais d'une grande imprudence politique. En effet, c'était s'exposer à de sérieux embarras, même pour un évêque, que de proposer, dans un pays britannique, la formation d'un « bataillon canadien » qui irait à l'étranger participer à un conflit où l'Angleterre n'avait pas encore officiellement pris parti.

Mais le prélat ne s'inquiète pas de la raison politique; il revient officiellement à la charge le 8 décembre suivant dans une lettre pastorale à ses diocésains; il y expose un projet visant à recueillir \$100,000 dans son territoire, soit 30 sous par tête. Cette fois, l'évêque parle d'un groupe de jeunes gens qui veulent se charger de l'organisation d'un corps de Zouaves canadiens, puis il fait cette restriction encore assez téméraire : « Nous demeurons étranger à ce mouvement laïque, mais nous vous l'avouerons, nous le bénissons de tout notre cœur et nous lui souhaitons un plein succès »<sup>9</sup>.

Cette réserve du prélat n'est que superficielle; en réalité, c'est une position officielle; tout le monde sait en effet qu'il a été l'âme dirigeante de l'œuvre des Zouaves. C'est bien d'après ses conseils et avec sa bénédiction que le 19 décembre se forme dans une des salles de l'Institut canadien-français, succursale de l'évêché, le Comité canadien des Zouaves pontificaux. Donnons encore à Mgr Bourget le crédit d'avoir organisé et soutenu de nombreuses croisades de prières et de non moins nombreuses quêtes. Dans presque tous ses mandements de l'époque, il parle de ses Zouaves. C'est lui qui demande aux religieuses de fabriquer de leurs mains un uniforme temporaire pour ses recrues. C'est lui qui soumet ses nouveaux soldats à une retraite particulière avant le départ, qui leur distribue toutes sortes d'objets de piété, qui bénit leur drapeau. C'est donc Mgr Bourget, l'évêque de Montréal, qui a joué en quelque sorte le rôle de ministre de la Défense nationale à l'égard des Zouaves pontificaux canadiens. Aussi le sculpteur Philippe Hébert, un ancien, a-t-il été bien inspiré dans l'un des bas-reliefs de son monument Bourget quand il a fixé dans le bronze le digne prélat entouré de ses troupes.

Son sous-ministre a été le futur évêque des Trois-Rivières, Mgr Louis-François Laflèche, lui aussi très attaché aux traditions romaines. Déjà, le 17 décembre 1860, alors qu'il était supérieur du Séminaire de Nicolet, il avait prononcé, en la cathédrale des Trois-Rivières, un sermon retentissant sur la question romaine et les Zouaves pontificaux de Lamoricière. Aussi, rien d'étonnant que Mgr Bourget l'ait choisi comme prédicateur à la cérémonie de départ des Zouaves canadiens, le 18 février 1868, en l'église Notre-Dame de Montréal. L'orateur, indisposé, doit couper son sermon aux deux-tiers; les journaux tâcheront le lendemain de suppléer à cette défaillance.

A côté de ces chefs nationaux, il y eut pour ainsi dire des représentants régionaux dans la personne des évêques qui ont tous soutenu avec plus ou moins de chaleur la campagne de recrutement des Zouaves appelés « milice sacrée » par l'archevêque de Québec, et « sainte milice » par

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*, 271.



l'évêque d'Ottawa. Les chefs de paroisse à leur tour ont servi en quelque sorte d'officiers de recrutement. C'est en effet le curé qui transmet directement à ses ouailles les exhortations de l'évêque. De plus, c'est lui qui éclaire la décision des jeunes gens qui viennent le consulter. Ainsi, pas un postulant n'est accepté sans la recommandation de son pasteur. Enfin pour compléter le dossier, ajoutons qu'au moins dix ecclésiastiques et un grand nombre d'étudiants sortent des séminaires, dirigés par le clergé, pour se faire soldats du Pape et que les Zouaves comptent au moins 6 aumôniers pour un corps expéditionnaire de quelque 500 hommes.

#### LE COMITÉ CANADIEN DES ZOUAVES PONTIFICAUX

Ainsi, la hiérarchie catholique prend une part directe et active au recrutement des Zouaves pontificaux canadiens tout autant que n'importe quel ministère de la Défense nationale en temps de guerre; toutefois elle a délégué ses pouvoirs administratifs à ce que Mgr Bourget appelait « un mouvement laïque », le Comité canadien des Zouaves pontificaux.

Il s'agit d'un groupe d'une dizaine de civils déjà influents dans la vie publique de la métropole, parmi lesquels on compte l'ancien Zouave Alfred Larocque. La première directive de cet état-major reflète évidemment l'attitude du ministre : « Le Comité n'enrôle ni ne recrute personne pour le compte d'une puissance en guerre avec un pouvoir ami de la Grande-Bretagne; son but est de régulariser et consolider le mouvement qui se fait parmi les Catholiques du Canada en faveur de la cause du Souverain Pontife »<sup>10</sup>.

Est-il besoin de souligner que cette déclaration est toute cousue de fil d'or ? A toutes fins pratiques, que la recrue signe son engagement au Canada ou à Rome cela n'importe guère puisque chacun paie ses frais de voyage. Toutefois, officiellement, le gouvernement de Sa Majesté n'a rien à redire : ces jeunes gens partent en touristes et selon une formule très heureuse capable de satisfaire les diplomates les plus retors : « Ils ne sont encore que des soldats d'intention »<sup>11</sup>.

Un autre rôle non moins important du Comité c'est de recueillir les souscriptions qui viennent de tous les coins du pays; cependant, il est plus qu'une agence de recrutement ou un organe logistique; il tient lieu auprès de ses administrés de nos Services auxiliaires. Il va même jusqu'à s'occuper de l'instruction et des projets d'avenir des Zouaves, sans parler des douceurs et des gâteries qu'il leur procure. Le Comité a de la sorte le droit de se montrer d'autant plus complaisant qu'il a été sévère dans le choix des recrues.

#### LES QUALITÉS REQUISES

Il n'était pas facile en effet de devenir soldat même d'intention. D'abord, les volontaires doivent fournir de quoi payer les frais de voyage aller-retour, acheter leur équipement et défrayer leur entretien pendant

<sup>10</sup>Lettre du Comité des Zouaves pontificaux, 14 juin 1868. Voir de Bellefeuille, *Le Canada et les Zouaves pontificaux*, 35.

<sup>11</sup>*Tribune* (New-York), 22 février 1868. Cf. de Bellefeuille, *Le Canada et les Zouaves pontificaux*, 152.



les deux années de leur service. Des Américains et des Canadiens des provinces anglaises qui veulent se joindre au contingent canadien, le Comité exige la somme de \$400 or. Pour les Québécois, on est apparemment un peu moins exigeant et on se contente de \$100 par homme. Il est vrai que de nombreuses quêtes organisées dans chaque paroisse du Bas-Canada peuvent combler la différence.

Mais on est bien plus exigeant sur les qualités morales que sur la question financière, et c'est encore à Mgr Bourget qu'on doit recourir pour entendre du chef même l'énumération des aptitudes requises : « Il faut, pour être admis au nombre des volontaires, avoir des sentiments assez élevés pour savoir se faire respecter par une conduite digne et honorable... Il faut qu'ils soient vraiment dévoués et capable de supporter avec courage et même avec joie les travaux, les fatigues, les dégoûts, les ennuis de la vie de soldat... Il faut qu'ils aient une assez bonne éducation pour pouvoir parvenir à quelque grade, servir dans les bureaux et étudier à Rome et enfin acquérir des connaissances qui pourront les rendre utiles à leur pays. »<sup>12</sup>

De toutes ces exigences, je voudrais relever celle qui a trait à l'éducation. Les Zouaves canadiens étaient des jeunes gens instruits. Les premiers volontaires comptaient des hommes de profession, des étudiants et une dizaine d'ecclésiastiques. Ces gens, semble-t-il, ont donné le ton. Aussi, lors du passage du premier contingent aux Etas-Unis, le *New York World* se croit-il en droit d'affirmer : « Plusieurs d'entre eux sont des jeunes gens favorisés de la fortune et les trois-quarts, au moins, ont reçu une éducation classique »<sup>13</sup>.

Cette proportion, peut-être un peu élevée pour les derniers contingents, est assez juste pour le premier qui s'est surtout recruté dans les collèges classiques. Une lettre datée de Rome après l'arrivée du quatrième détachement vient corroborer cette opinion : « ... sur 200 Canadiens présents sous les drapeaux de Pie IX, 100 ont terminé leurs études classiques et se disposaient à exercer des professions libérales... Douze, déjà distingués dans le barreau, ont abandonné leur carrière... Cinq se sont résignés à changer la sainte robe du séminariste contre l'uniforme des Zouaves. »<sup>14</sup>

Les dossiers qu'il m'a été permis de consulter aux Archives des Zouaves<sup>15</sup> appuient ces chiffres de très près. Sur 227 fiches personnelles on compte 100 cours classiques, soit bien près de la moitié.

Il ne serait peut-être pas inutile d'ajouter que parmi ces 227 volontaires, 48 avaient obtenu leur certificat de cadet de première ou deuxième classe. D'après la *Tribune* de New-York : « ... cinquante d'entre eux [dans le 1<sup>er</sup> contingent de 135 hommes] sont des gradués des écoles militaires et un plus grand nombre ont porté les armes contre les Fénians »<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>12</sup>*Mandements*, V, 482.

<sup>13</sup>*New York World*, 22 février 1868. Cf. de Bellefeuille, *Le Canada et les Zouaves pontificaux*, 153.

<sup>14</sup>*La Voix du Golfe* (Rimouski, Qué.), 4 août 1868.

<sup>15</sup>Château Ramezay, Montréal.

<sup>16</sup>*Tribune*, 22 février 1868.

Quant aux aptitudes physiques on paraît avoir été également assez minutieux. Le volontaire, une fois examiné et accepté par le médecin de sa localité, se rend à Montréal par le Grand Tronc, à prix réduit; il y reçoit hospitalité gratuite. Il passe au bureau du Comité, puis chez le photographe, et enfin devant une commission de trois médecins, parmi lesquels il est assez curieux de relever le nom d'un professeur d'obstétrique. On veut évidemment sonder tous les secrets !

#### LE PREMIER CONTINGENT

Et c'est ainsi que se forme le premier contingent. Il y eut 804 offres de service; on en accepta 135. Il est cependant difficile d'envoyer ces soldats à la queue leu leu, en habits civils. Non ! ils auront un uniforme et c'est Mgr Bourget qui en confie la fabrication à ses chères sœurs, « anges de la terre travaillant pour leurs frères ». Mais un contingent de laïques en uniforme ne peut se passer d'un drapeau. Cette fois, l'abbé Rousselot, curé de Notre-Dame, ravit à son supérieur épiscopal, la faveur d'en faire don aux Zouaves. Mgr Bourget ne pourra se permettre que la bénédiction. Le dessin est confié au sculpteur Napoléon Bourassa. La devise des Zouaves canadiens : « Aime Dieu et va ton chemin » est écrite en lettre rouge sur le fond de l'écu qui est au champ d'azur, traversé d'un chevron d'argent sur lequel on voit deux feuilles d'érable, et au milieu un castor<sup>17</sup>. Ce sont les Dames de l'Hôpital Général de Montréal qui exécutent l'œuvre de Bourassa.

Maintenant le départ est fixé au 19 février. Trente mille personnes y assistent. A New-York, à Brest, à Paris, à Lyon, à Marseille, on rivalise d'enthousiasme à l'égard de nos « Croisés » qui débarquent à Rome le 10 mars. On accorde aux volontaires canadiens des honneurs dignes des plus grands triomphateurs romains. Il ne manquait à leur suite que les généraux vaincus, mais Garibaldi n'avait pas voulu se laisser attraper. Les attendaient à la gare tous les officiers supérieurs de l'armée pontificale, une multitude de Zouaves, musique en tête, un peuple innombrable, et comme une belle couronne, Leurs Majestés le roi et la reine de Naples. Le capitaine Taillefer, un peu ému, range ses troupes sur le quai de la gare, les met au garde-à-vous par un retentissant « Attention », car il commande en anglais, et il va présenter ses hommes à son futur chef, le lieutenant-colonel de Charette. Les oies du Capitole ont dû pousser un cri d'effroi en voyant apparaître ces guerriers sans armes, munis d'un drapeau portant castor et feuilles d'érable ! De Charette qui sans doute songe déjà à l'emploi d'interprètes pour l'instruction de ces nouvelles troupes s'adresse en anglais à Taillefer qui répond en français à la grande joie du baron : « Comment, j'ai le bonheur de presser la main à des compatriotes ! Les Canadiens sont donc de vrais Français ! C'est splendide ! »<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup>Pour une description complète, voir de Bellefeuille, *Le Canada et les Zouaves pontificaux*, 38. Ce drapeau est conservé à la cathédrale Saint-Jacques de Montréal, dans la chapelle du Sacré-Cœur où l'on trouve également quatre tablettes de marbre portant le nom des Zouaves canadiens.

<sup>18</sup>C. E. Rouleau, *Souvenirs de voyage d'un soldat de Pie IX* (Québec, 1881), vii.



Après un défilé triomphal dans les rues de Rome, on les caserne dans un couvent de franciscains. Le lendemain, 11 mars, ils signent l'engagement officiel pour deux ans dans l'armée pontificale, puis ils commencent immédiatement l'exercice.

### LA JOURNÉE DU ZOUAVE

La *tromba* sonne le réveil à cinq heures alors que le troupier reçoit, dans un gobelet en fer-blanc, un demi-litre de café noir. Le lever a lieu une demi-heure plus tard, puis l'appel se fait à six heures et demie. L'exercice commence aussitôt et dure jusqu'à 9 heures et demie, moment où l'on se rend à la cuisine prendre une gamelle de soupe. On recommence de midi à 3 heures et demie, puis le reste du jour, jusqu'à 8 heures, est consacré aux corvées et au nettoyage. Vers 5 heures les estomacs sont vides; la soupe du matin est oubliée depuis longtemps. Alors c'est le rata, repas de légumes : haricots et pommes de terre à l'eau. La retraite sonne à 9 heures et demie et à 10 heures, extinction des feux. Cependant, on peut acheter à un demi-sou une formule de permission que le zouave remplit et que le capitaine signe — parfois. Il existe des permissions de dix heures, de théâtre ou de la nuit.

Comme dans toute autre armée, il y a moult corvées : corvée de pain, corvée de vivres, corvée de soupe, corvée de cuisine, corvée de quartier et d'autres encore.

Le service est très dur. Il est coutumier de marcher huit à neuf milles avant le déjeuner, avec soixante livres sur le dos et le fusil Remington<sup>19</sup>. La marche quotidienne est en moyenne de 24 à 30 milles par jour.

Les Canadiens qui sont envoyés à Villettri, le 9 juin, pour chasser les brigands dans les montagnes environnantes sont en service presque jour et nuit, mais ils réussissent à faire disparaître cette menace contre Rome. Leur mission terminée, ils reviennent s'installer aux Termini mais repartent aussitôt pour le camp d'Annibal, endroit même où le général carthaginois établit ses quartiers avant la bataille de Trasimène. Ils parcourent cette distance de 24 milles en 10 heures. On mentionne même un combat simulé d'une nature très sérieuse dans la nuit du 20 août alors que l'un des camps cherche à s'emparer de la ville d'Albano pendant que l'autre la défend. On mettait donc déjà beaucoup de réalisme dans l'instruction. C'est ainsi que l'un de ces « Zouzous » pouvait plus tard affirmer : « Dans aucune armée d'Europe, le service militaire n'est aussi rude et aussi pénible que l'était celui des Zouaves à Rome. Nous n'avions que sept sous par jour et par homme à manger à l'ordinaire; jamais de vin dans un pays où le plus pauvre paysan en boit journellement. »<sup>20</sup>

La solde est aussi maigre que la nourriture : d'abord 3 sous par jour, puis, bientôt, augmentation descendante à 2 sous « qui ne suffisent même pas à acheter ce qu'il faut pour s'astiquer »<sup>21</sup>.

<sup>19</sup>Le Remington, de fabrication danoise, tirait jusqu'à quinze coups à la minute.

<sup>20</sup>Gustave Drolet, *Zouaviana* (Montréal, 1898), 415.

<sup>21</sup>Archives Buies, chez Mme Auguste Côté, Rimouski (Qué.). Lettre d'Estimauville à Buies, 23 juin 1868.



## LES ÉTUDES

D'ailleurs, ils ne font pas que s'exercer. Ils profitent de leur séjour à Rome pour visiter et s'instruire. D'abord ils ont tous été reçus en audience par le Pape et ils ont admiré les trésors artistiques du Vatican. Ils ont visité les lieux célèbres par leur histoire romaine et rafraîchi leurs souvenirs classiques. Leurs lettres sont remplies de noms et d'allusions historiques. Aussi leur aumônier peut-il affirmer plus tard : « ... votre séjour en Italie vous a appris à étudier l'histoire sur les blocs de marbre et de granit et vous a initiés à l'étude et à la connaissance des beaux-arts »<sup>22</sup>.

Il existe même des cours du soir où ils étudient l'italien. Aussi, les Canadiens servent-ils souvent d'interprètes pour l'instruction sur le service de place et le tir, parmi ces troupes composées de Français, d'Espagnols, d'Allemands, d'Anglais, de Hollandais et même d'Africains.

Parce qu'ils sont studieux et appliqués, ils sont aimés de leurs chefs. Le colonel Allet est allé jusqu'à dire « qu'avec 10,000 Canadiens il se faisait fort de parcourir toute l'Italie en vainqueur »<sup>23</sup>. Et de même que le R 22<sup>e</sup> R se glorifie à juste titre d'avoir veillé sur le palais de Buckingham, ainsi les Zouaves canadiens sont légitimement fiers d'avoir monté la garde à Saint-Pierre de Rome, le 8 décembre 1869, à l'ouverture du Concile Oecuménique qui réunit tous les princes de l'Eglise. Nos Zouzous restent debout pendant près de dix heures consécutives après n'avoir pris le matin qu'un demi-litre de café noir.

S'ils constituent, au dire même du général Kansler, « un bon élément », si le colonel Allet veut « les disperser dans différentes compagnies afin qu'ils agissent plus puissamment par leur bon esprit sur tout le régiment », si le lieutenant-colonel de Charette qui les commande les appelle familièrement ses « castors » et qu'il est si fier d'eux, c'est que les Canadiens ont un bon moral.

Ces qualités ne pouvaient passer inaperçues aux yeux de l'autorité supérieure. Aussi je crois que les Canadiens ont eu plus que leur part de promotions. Rappelons que le zouave Hugh Murray, sergent à la bataille de Mentana, passe sous-lieutenant, puis lieutenant. L'autre officier eut une carrière assez curieuse. Il s'agit du zouave Joseph Taillefer. Capitaine de milice avant son départ du Canada, il commande jusqu'à Rome le 1<sup>er</sup> contingent, sous les ordres du chanoine Moreau. A son arrivée, il doit abandonner ses épaulettes et rentrer dans le rang. Mais ses chefs ont vite reconnu ses qualités et le nomment caporal. Dès le mois de mai, il passe sergent et devient instructeur. On jugera facilement de ses aptitudes de chef par cette appréciation du cardinal Antonelli, ministre des armes du Pape : « ... à l'époque de la promotion de M. Taillefer au grade de sous-lieutenant, on l'avait fait passer avant un prince qui avait plus de service et dont la conduite était très satisfaisante car cette promotion a été en même temps une récompense des mérites personnels du nouveau gradé et la reconnaissance de la bonne conduite du corps des Canadiens »<sup>24</sup>.

<sup>22</sup>*Bulletin de l'Union Allet* (Montréal), 25 mars 1874, 97.

<sup>23</sup>Voir de Bellefeuille, *Le Canada et les Zouaves pontificaux*, 202.

<sup>24</sup>C. E. Rouleau, *Souvenirs*, 235.

Quant aux sous-officiers, ils furent nombreux. Déjà en juillet, il y a 42 Canadiens à l'école des gradés. Au tableau des promotions, sur 174 noms rapportés, on relève 33 sergents et 57 caporaux. C'est dire que les troupes canadiennes et une partie des compagnies étrangères étaient encadrées de sous-officiers canadiens.

Mais si l'on peut vanter la belle formation intellectuelle et militaire du Zouave canadien, on ne saurait louer sa valeur guerrière car il n'a guère participé au combat. Il a mieux connu les années d'attente que les heures d'action. Bon soldat en garnison, il eut certes montré de la vaillance au combat. Lors du siège de Rome, il y avait plus de deux cents Canadiens; le combat n'a duré que cinq heures. Les Canadiens se trouvent à peu près tous à la porte Pia où va porter le gros de l'attaque. Ils sont prêts à combattre jusqu'à la mort. On est à l'aube du 20 septembre. Le lieutenant Taillefer entend creuser; vite il part en reconnaissance, puis découvrant les travaux de l'ennemi, il envoie un message demandant l'intervention de l'artillerie. Il reçoit un refus qui est en même temps un ordre : « Pas d'attaque de notre part; il faut laisser l'ennemi commencer »<sup>25</sup>.

Cette réponse très chevaleresque mais peu conforme aux principes de la guerre indiquait déjà que la défense de Rome serait toute symbolique. Aussi dès que les assaillants pratiquent une brèche près de la porte Pia, le Pape fait hisser le drapeau blanc afin d'éviter une effusion inutile de sang. Les Canadiens à la vue du signal de capitulation éprouvent un sentiment de stupeur et presque de révolte : « Si jamais un murmure s'éleva de nos cœurs contre le Saint-Père, ce fut à ce moment-là »<sup>26</sup>.

Les esprits une fois calmés, on put se consoler à la pensée que parmi les seize tués de la journée on ne comptait pas un seul Canadien. Le corps expéditionnaire ne laisserait donc derrière lui à son départ que huit victimes des fièvres romaines et un noyé. Un dixième trouvera la mort dans un hôpital des suites de blessures reçues en combattant avec ses anciens camarades sur le sol envahi de la France. Et Hugh Murray devenu capitaine tombera l'épée à la main sous les murs de Manrèse en Espagne au service du roi Charles VII.

La reddition de Rome entraîne des conséquences assez pénibles pour les vaincus canadiens. On les évacue d'abord à Civita Vecchia. Avec les Anglais ils sont ensuite dirigés vers Livourne. N'eût été du consul britannique de cette ville et de Mgr Stoner, aumônier des Zouaves de Grande-Bretagne, les fonctionnaires républicains auraient débarqué nos compatriotes sur l'île d'Elbe. Il faut sept jours de pourparlers pour qu'on les laisse s'embarquer avec les autres sujets de la Reine et, après deux semaines de navigation périlleuse, ils abordent à Liverpool. Ils sont reçus comme des héros et logent chez des familles anglaises.

La traversée de retour est très pénible et l'*Idaho* vient si près de faire naufrage que les 200 Zouaves rapatriés offrent un ex-voto s'ils sont sauvés<sup>27</sup>. Le vaisseau passablement avarié rentre dans le port de New-

<sup>25</sup>*Bulletin de l'Union Allet*, 25 juin 1874, 123.

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid.*, 25 septembre 1880, 81.

<sup>27</sup>Cette relique, fac-similé en argent de l'*Idaho*, est suspendue au sanctuaire de Notre-Dame du Bonsecours, à Montréal.

York le 5 novembre et le lendemain après-midi les Zouaves reviennent dans la métropole canadienne, accueillis par une foule de 50,000 personnes.

Telle est l'expédition des Zouaves canadiens, sorte de pèlerinage militaire, culturel et religieux que de jeunes Canadiens sont allés faire en Italie. En tout, 390 se sont rendus dans la Ville Eternelle, 115 autres, formant le 7<sup>e</sup> contingent, ont dû rebrousser chemin à Brest, le conflit étant à peu près terminé en Italie.

Les Zouaves canadiens ont été d'excellents ambassadeurs parmi les troupes de différentes nations : la France, les Etats-Unis, l'Espagne, la Belgique et le Commonwealth britannique; ils ont également été de grands artisans d'unité nationale, ayant réuni dans leurs rangs des Canadiens d'expression anglaise et française. Rappelons-nous avec fierté nos deux blessés de Mentana : Hugh Murray et Alfred Larocque<sup>28</sup>.

<sup>28</sup>The discussion which followed this paper appears on page 40 at the end of the paper given by Sam H. S. Hughes in the same session.



## SIR SAM HUGHES AND THE PROBLEM OF IMPERIALISM

SAM H. S. HUGHES

*Welland, Ontario*

SHOULD any one attempt to write what used to be called a standard work about Sir Sam Hughes he will discover very soon that his subject is unrewarding. A man who had a highly developed talent for notoriety, such as few Canadian politicians have possessed, Sir Sam must often have dwelt upon his future fame, but from either carelessness or impatience he gave little heed to the task of the historian. He kept few private papers and none organized after the manner of men who have an eye for biography. The few which he left are the unsatisfactory gleanings of brief periods of inactivity. When he was busy there must have been a vast amount of correspondence of a private and semi-private nature, and if report be true a great number of his papers were destroyed in the Department of Militia and Defence after his death. The private records of his early life, and of the period before he became Minister of Militia in the Borden Government, are likewise meagre. For this heedlessness the historian has taken, and will probably continue to take, a just measure of revenge.

One volume has appeared since his death which can best be described as an act of friendship—a brief biographical sketch by the late Brigadier General Charles F. Winter, who was Military Secretary when Hughes was Minister. The author makes no attempt to deal with historical material and the book is in no sense systematic. Yet as a repository of anecdotes and atmosphere it is all anyone intended it to be and it was compiled without any assistance from family sources. There are several memoirs and biographies of other men in which Sam Hughes is either acclaimed or assailed, and finally there are the beginnings of an official history of the Canadian forces in the First World War, of which it is perhaps fair to say that on this subject it represents the attitude of officialdom armed with a knowledge of after events.

In view of these difficulties and deficiencies it is surprising that the memory of Sam Hughes remains green among Canadians of every age and many origins. Those who did not know him personally have heard fabulous stories from those who did, and of the older generation of his countrymen there are few who once having met him are not still gratified to testify to a relationship which over the years and in the course of numerous anecdotes appears to have been more intimate than perhaps it was. For the stories, friendly or hostile, are legion. Not all of them are true and very few can bear close scrutiny. Many are obviously apocryphal and fail to take into account the fact that Sam Hughes was a non-drinking, non-smoking Methodist of Presbyterian origin, widely known to the Canadian soldier of the First World War as the "Foe of Booze." He was all his life, and remains to this day, a natural focus for story telling. He sought applause on every hand and not infrequently met with derision.

He had a prodigious, almost superhuman, memory, the tricks of which form the theme of many fugitive recollections. A good memory for people has rightly been regarded as one of the foremost of political assets. It bespeaks an interest in individuals of the most flattering kind. It transforms a passing acquaintance recognized years after into a fast friend. The friends of Sam Hughes were not all of them staunch in the hours of trial, but in every corner of the country, in every walk of life, he left men and women behind him who generally speaking wished him well. They have not allowed his memory to fade.

Sam Hughes was born in Darlington Township in the County of Durham in 1853. He had three brothers and seven sisters. His father, John Hughes, was, as a victim of the ebb-tide of Irish emigration in the forties, a farmer in spite of himself in the austere region south of Lake Scugog. John Hughes farmed with indifferent success but he was a man of parts and good humour, taught school, presided at public meetings, and instilled in his children a liking for literature. His sons in their anxiety to disclaim the taint of native Irish blood insisted on a Welsh or Scottish origin for the family, but it is probable that the numerous Hugheses of County Tyrone are native to the soil and were there before the plantations of Ulster.

Like many literate young men of his day, when formal education was rare and a university degree a mark of distinction, Sam Hughes sought escape from the life to which his father had become a reluctant convert and became a schoolmaster. A brief period of service in the Fenian Raid of 1870 gave him a taste of the world. At all events it confirmed two of the dominant influences of his life—the powerful and perverse loyalty to Britain of his Ulster forbears and a love of “volunteering” in a day when the Canadian militia was an even more widespread social and recreational force than it is today. Hughes taught briefly in Belleville and Bowmanville, and finally in Toronto where, for eleven years, he was English and History master at the old Toronto Collegiate Institute. This was a period which he loved to recall, of part-time attendance at the University, of great athletic activity especially on the lacrosse field, and of the birth of two of his three children. He enjoyed teaching and indeed there was always about him a marked didactic quality which inspired much of his celebrated tactlessness.

But the rewards of teaching were neither so tangible nor so impressive as Sam Hughes desired. After failing in an attempt to become Inspector of Schools in West Durham<sup>1</sup> he made what must have seemed a rash move to his friends and particularly to his family. He bought a country newspaper, the *Lindsay Warder*, and embarked on a tempestuous period of political agitation and self-advertisement which soon gave him the limelight he always admitted desiring. He was thirty-two.

Lindsay was then a town which had emerged barely ten years before from the lawlessness of lumbering.<sup>2</sup> Then as now it was the gateway to

<sup>1</sup>Private Papers and Memorials in the possession of the author, “Educational Standing, etc. of Mr. Samuel Hughes.”

<sup>2</sup>Watson Kirkconnell, *Victoria County Centennial History* (Lindsay, 1921).



the wild regions of Haliburton; however, they were not then traversed by impeccable motor roads but isolated and inhospitable and pitifully unproductive. Haliburton was inhabited almost exclusively by Protestant English and Irish who had been transported thither from the richest farmlands of the British Isles. They were a simple, self-reliant people, who lived very poorly in scattered communities which, without an abundance of fish and lumber always at hand, would soon have perished. With the uninhibited enthusiasm of a newcomer, whose unrestrained newspaper agitation was getting him a mixed reception in the prosperous environment of Lindsay, Sam Hughes made this rugged northern countryside his spiritual home. In his eyes it took on the glamour of the Scottish Highlands which he had never seen and for forty years at Masonic, Orange, and political gatherings and over the rail and tree-stump fences he spoke in still unforgotten language to those whom he called "the free men and women of North Victoria." For North Victoria he was first elected to the House of Commons in 1892, where he sat for nearly thirty years thereafter. Although the constituency was enlarged to contain Lindsay and the fair farmlands of South Victoria, it was in the North that he was strongest. There, the great controversies were of little moment; election contests were minor episodes of many years of devotion on either side.

When Hughes began his newspaper work he flung himself from one controversy to another. Flavels<sup>3</sup> and Fenians alike were assailed with the type of editorial invective which is no longer fashionable in an age when the practice of plain speaking has declined. The little newspaper office was burned down, and shots were fired at the ardent editor in the darkened streets. A libel action was repelled without benefit of counsel. In a few short years the journalistic venture, which had never been profitable, had served its purpose. North Victoria sent a Conservative member to the House of Commons after a long connection with Reform. At the masthead of the *Warder* stood the following uncompromising quatrain:

A union of hearts, A union of hands,  
A union no man can sever,  
A union of tongues, A union of lands,  
And the flag—British Union forever.

The introspective cast of British political thought at the close of the nineteenth century is well known to historians. The wide bounds of empire became solidly set and the chill of economic competition sharpened the horizon on every side. The principal beneficiaries of the Industrial Revolution became self-conscious about what in Professor Seeley's famous phrase they had created "in a fit of absence of mind." Problems of imperial defence and imperial government interwoven with the perpetual problem of Canada's relationship with the United States were

<sup>3</sup>The name "Flavelle" is an embellishment of the original name of "Flavel" (pronounced to rhyme with gravel) by which the family was known in the old days in Peterborough and Lindsay.



actively discussed in this country by those who on the one hand looked for eventual annexation and on the other sought a larger share of the material rewards of empire. Hughes found in Victoria County strong but confused sentiment among the farmers in favour of commercial union with the United States—a not unnatural hankering for the good times of Reciprocity days. He set himself against this opinion and especially against the annexationist agitation which was often associated with it. As early as 1887 a roving representative of the *Detroit Evening News* found that the *Lindsay Warder* had its own version of commercial union, which was to consist of one federal state comprising the British Empire and the United States of America and ruled by the hereditary sovereigns of Great Britain!<sup>4</sup> From this time forward Hughes seriously advocated the cause of what was known as Imperial Federation although the prize package which he had offered to his neighbours on this occasion appears to have been only a *ballon d'essai* for local opinion.

By 1892 the Liberal-Conservative party which claimed the adherence of the new member for North Victoria was staggering in the confident stride which Confederation, the National Policy, and the Pacific Railway had enabled it to take. It had lost the incomparable guidance of Sir John A. Macdonald. It was, to borrow Mr. Guedalla's phrase, "an *arriviste* who had arrived." Deriving support from ill-assorted and mutually antagonistic groups, the party entered upon a period of confused and maladroit retreat, and without purpose or consistent leadership lurched towards the precipice of 1896. The prospect was by no means encouraging for a new member, but during this period Hughes came into contact with one of the Canadian worthies, whose independent mind and political conduct were powerful influences upon the younger man. Sir Donald Smith, as he then was, was at this time the member for Montreal West and during the period of paralysis which followed the death of Sir John Thompson, Hughes is reported to have looked to Smith as the only hope of the Conservative party.<sup>5</sup> Smith's views on the imperial relationship were a great deal more mature and methodical than Hughes's and it is reasonable to believe that they were in large measure absorbed by the latter. But there was another and more significant bond. Hughes as an enthusiastic militia-man was drawn to the old empire-builder who never concealed an acute interest in military affairs.

Then and thereafter until the end of his life Sam Hughes was obsessed with the importance of colonial participation in the wars of the Empire. We are now half a century away from the South African War and it is difficult to avoid the conclusion in the light of two subsequent wars that colonial politicians of the day were governed by servile motives. But England then as always made no effort to draw her colonies on to the stage of world events. The modest efforts of Joseph Chamberlain were decried as jingoism: the problem for the colonial loyalist was in essence the same as for the colonial republican, to obtain greater recognition and freedom

<sup>4</sup>*Detroit Evening News*, Aug. 10, 1887.

<sup>5</sup>Beckles Wilson, *The Life of Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal* (London and Toronto, 1915), 428.

of action for his own colony. If the channel of constitutional development was sluggish and obstructed, that of defence might reasonably be expected to be clear. Defence has always been the touchstone of imperial speculation. During three wars it has wrought profound changes in the structure of the Empire.

As the South African War approached, Sam Hughes saw an opportunity to ride his hobby-horse to some purpose. In the session of 1899 he gave notice of his favourite motion on the expediency of colonial assistance in British wars, a proposition which found no favour on either side of the House. In the press he openly canvassed the youth of Canada to recruit a corps for active service in South Africa. As Officer Commanding the 45th Battalion he offered his services simultaneously to the Minister of Militia and Defence, Dr. F. W. Borden, and to the British Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, to raise and command a Canadian unit for service in the Transvaal. This offer, which was received with every sign of favour, provoked a bitter quarrel with Major General Hutton, the Imperial officer then commanding the Canadian militia. Hutton, whose life work was directed towards the same goal as that of Hughes, strongly resented the freedom of action enjoyed by a militia officer who was also a member of Parliament. By adopting a very narrow although strictly correct view of the iniquity of ignoring the proper channels of communication, he did his own reputation and that of the Imperial Army in Canada a singular disservice. It is unnecessary here to recount the details of the quarrel which resulted in Hughes going to South Africa as a civilian forbidden military employment, and scarcely a year after in the final breach between Hutton and Dr. Borden, and the former's recall from Canada.<sup>6</sup>

Hughes's experience in South Africa had a lasting effect upon his political and military opinions. From the first he had seized upon the occasion as an opportunity to demonstrate his cherished theories about the value of colonial troops which he claimed Hutton had disparaged. History could hardly have provided him with a better proving ground and justification. The conduct of the war by the mother country was the jest of Europe. The colonial contingents were, on the whole, composed of men who could shoot and ride better than their comrades from the United Kingdom. British generalship was admittedly bad until a series of disasters brought Roberts and Kitchener to the scene with overwhelming forces. Hughes, who had passed the long voyage in civilian clothes in accordance with Hutton's order, began his campaign by sitting down in the Grand Hotel in Capetown and writing to Lord Methuen and other commanders whom he had met during the Diamond Jubilee celebrations in 1897. He begged for employment.<sup>7</sup> This was eventually given him on the line of communications as a transport officer. In somewhat less

<sup>6</sup>*Canada, Sessional Papers*, 1900, 77 and 77a, Return to an order of the House of Commons, dated 19th February, 1900, for copies of all correspondence . . . touching the conduct of Lieut.-Col. Hughes, M.P.; Sir Charles Lucas, *The Empire at War* (Oxford, 1921), I, 146-7.

<sup>7</sup>Private Papers, letter from Hughes to Lord Methuen, Dec. 6, 1899.



than a year he had become a senior intelligence staff officer with a flair for reconnaissance, and assisted by a spirited commentary on the campaign in his letters to friends at home the Hughes legend began to grow.<sup>8</sup> He was described by *The Times* as the "beau ideal of a leader of irregular troops."<sup>9</sup> He began to be idolized by the young soldiers as a sensible, hard-headed officer who did not waste the lives of his men.<sup>10</sup> His career ended abruptly while he was serving under Sir Charles Warren who, by all accounts, enjoyed no such reputation. As in the Hutton incident, Hughes's taste for voluminous correspondence was the cause of his discomfiture, and some of his strictures upon Warren and his staff were reported in Capetown. Ostensibly in command of the troopship *Gascon* he was returned to England in 1900, and although he never admitted in public the cause of his removal from the theatre, it is clear that he was not deceived.<sup>11</sup>

Nevertheless, Colonel Sam Hughes, who had left Canada as a martyr, returned a hero. There were many important people who were prepared to deny him a crown in either capacity, but the vigorous, handsome 47-year-old officer cut quite a figure among his unsophisticated fellow-countrymen. It was known that he had no resources and had made sacrifices for his opinions which were themselves flattering to Canadian susceptibilities. Service on the battlefield was not then the common experience of healthy manhood which it has since become. The South African episode had brought Hughes into touch with men who instantaneously responded to Canadian imperialism. He was at once a member of Parliament and a man of action. Lord Milner was at the time the most brilliant exponent of practical imperialism and his reputation was heavily involved in South Africa. He and his disciples, such as Lionel Curtis and Leopold Amery, established a warm and sympathetic relationship with the Canadians.<sup>12</sup> They no doubt saw in Sam Hughes and those like him the perfect instrument of their policy of creating an imperial state and there is no doubt that he, for his part, kept the imperial vision in his mind's eye, if only with the fatalistic assurance of the Ulsterman that the mother country must be magnified in spite of herself. Generals Hutton and Warren might have discouraged the most ardent.

Hughes resumed with zest the role of opposition member under the long tutelage provided by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. In and out of season he urged full partnership of the colonies with the mother country especially in the sphere of defence. He continued to maintain good relations with Sir Frederick Borden, the Liberal Minister of Militia and Defence, and his cousin, the Leader of the Opposition, came to regard Hughes as a reliable parliamentarian.<sup>13</sup> The latter's reaction to the Dundonald incident, which provoked the same constitutional argument with which he

<sup>8</sup>Private Papers, *Watchman-Warder* (Lindsay), April 19, 1900.

<sup>9</sup>Private Papers, undated clippings from the *Mail and Empire* (Toronto), 1900.

<sup>10</sup>Private Papers; and Lionel Curtis, *Victorian Rhymes* (Oxford, 1942), 17.

<sup>11</sup>Private Papers, letter from Hughes to Lord Roberts, Nov. 27, 1910.

<sup>12</sup>Charles F. Winter, *Lieutenant-General the Hon. Sir Sam Hughes, K.C.B., M.P.* (Toronto, 1931), 23-4; and Curtis, *Victorian Rhymes*.

<sup>13</sup>Henry Borden (ed.), *Robert Laird Borden: His Memoirs* (Toronto, 1938), I, 74.



had belaboured Hutton, will be quoted against him and against anyone who seeks to develop a pattern of consistency in his political life. But Dundonald was no disparager of colonial troops—he was a dashing cavalry officer who had commanded a brigade in South Africa which comprised Lord Strathcona's Horse, and he was a personal friend who moreover had been shamefully treated in the Province of Quebec.

On February 2, 1905, Colonel Hughes addressed the Empire Club in Toronto on "The Defence of the Empire."<sup>14</sup> This was one of many speeches and articles of the same tenor, but it contains his life-long position in a nutshell.

At the outset I may say that I can regard no possible defence of the Empire that does not involve a full partnership union of Great Britain and all her colonies. I maintain, and as you are well aware have always maintained, that any system must be largely democratic—must be of the people. . . . There will be thousands of high and prominent positions that will thus be thrown open to the young men of the Dominion of Canada because we will then be full partners in the Empire. . . . There would be no extravagant taxation under a broad militia system. There would be no creation of classes. There would be no humiliating of the men by making the private soldier a separate class by himself and the officer a separate class by himself. . . . I have never believed that discipline and training meant abasement of the men trained: it never meant oppression or slavery. On the contrary, discipline means polish, education, development of the spirit of individuality and of liberty. It means patriotism and loyalty to your country. The development of the physical means manhood; and from the military standpoint it means knowing how to shoot.

He went on in some detail to elaborate a system of militia training, beginning with the cadet system in the schools which he was to do so much to foster and to establish in the years of power. In the course of this address he freely condemned the attitude of people who say, "Stay as we are, a colony of the Empire, and contribute not only to our own militia but contribute also with sums to the imperial treasury for battleships and to carry on wars in foreign lands." "It involves," he said, "the principle for which our neighbours across the border fought and died, and which has been recognized throughout the World ever since—that taxation carries with it the right of representation." At a later date he did not give marked support to R. L. Borden's naval policy, which was that and nothing else, and in fact a highly professionalized Royal Navy did not fit into his scheme of an imperial militia armed and authorized by an imperial federal parliament.

When at last, after a sojourn in the wilderness which no other Conservative leader in Canada has survived, Borden became Prime Minister, he reluctantly gave the Militia and Defence portfolio to the most active promoter of militia training in Canada.<sup>15</sup> Sir Frederick Borden had inter-

<sup>14</sup>J. Castell Hopkins (ed.), *Empire Club Speeches 1904-5* (Toronto, 1906), 176-84.

<sup>15</sup>Borden, *Memoirs*, I, 330.

ceded with his cousin and still more powerful was the request of one who on the morrow of the anti-Reciprocity triumph could not be denied. This was Sir Clifford Sifton, one of the few members of the House who saw in Hughes something more than an irresponsible enthusiast.<sup>16</sup> Lord Grey was not pleased,<sup>17</sup> and the new imperial champion was to learn the military disadvantages of a vice-regal office shorn of its administrative functions but still permitted wide scope for interference in military affairs, especially when filled by a prince of the blood with a Hanoverian interest in the minutiae of military custom and dress.<sup>18</sup>

The new Minister, with the dreams of a lifetime to fulfil, succeeded in nearly doubling his estimates in the two years before the outbreak of war.<sup>19</sup> He missed no opportunity of warning the country against the German danger.<sup>20</sup> With ample experience of the real requirements of the militia and in fulfilment of his declared belief in an imperial militia democratically raised and trained, he embarked on an unprecedented programme of building armouries,<sup>21</sup> and he made cadet training a reality almost overnight.<sup>22</sup> These activities caused a hum of criticism which was not confined to the Opposition. Hughes's colleagues in the Cabinet, with the notable exception of the Prime Minister, were uneasy at the activity developed by a department which had been neglected and disparaged since Confederation. When, in August, 1914, the Minister sprang upon the stage in full panoply and persistently held the spotlight thereafter, open friction developed.<sup>23</sup>

The public estimate of the usefulness of Hughes's career has never been free from controversy, but the assembly and dispatch of the First Canadian Contingent in October, 1914 is justly regarded as a triumph of energy and devotion. Like Winston Churchill's timely preparation of the Grand Fleet in a similarly unfavourable atmosphere, it was an achievement which was to ensure a great measure of public indulgence for its author as the hostile clamour rose around him. Obsessed as he was with the urgency of the hour, Hughes's usual geniality was more and more replaced by an imperious temper aggravated by the manoeuvres indulged in without pause by certain of his colleagues.

To examine the record of Sir Sam Hughes's conduct of his transformed Department during the first two war-time years is not within the scope of this paper. In 1914 he was 61 years old and thus embarked upon the fulfilment of his life's design at an age when the peak of activity is usually past. Anyone who thought that his tirelessly reiterated

<sup>16</sup>John W. Dafoe, *Clifford Sifton in Relation to His Times* (Toronto, 1931), 386.

<sup>17</sup>Borden, *Memoirs*, I, 330.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, I, 459 n., 462.

<sup>19</sup>A. F. Duguid, *Official History of the Canadian Forces in the Great War 1914-1919* (Ottawa, 1939), I, 3.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, Appendix 6.

<sup>21</sup>Winter, *Sir Sam Hughes*, 36-42.

<sup>22</sup>Lucas, *The Empire at War*, I, 236.

<sup>23</sup>D. M. A. R. Vince, "The Acting Overseas Sub-Militia Council and the Resignation of Sir Sam Hughes" (*Canadian Historical Review*, XXXI, March, 1950, 5); and Private Papers.



views of the duty of Canada within the Empire unfitted him for the task of maintaining its identity and freedom of action in war-time was quickly disabused. While recognizing the obvious limitations of the Canadian militia in matters of command, and being prepared to accept a War Office nomination for the command of the First Division, he reacted sharply to Lord Kitchener's suggestion that the contingent should be broken up to reinforce British formations as an alternative to forming that division at all. The occasion when the sacrosanct Secretary of State for War was defied in his own office on this point has been recorded by the official historian without comment.<sup>24</sup> The long battle on behalf of the Ross rifle used exclusively by the Canadian militia since its adoption in 1902 is a chapter in itself. If it is conceded that the Ross was a better target than service rifle, this might only have served to reinforce the confidence of the Minister, who had been President of the Dominion Rifle Association, had created the Connaught Ranges, and had fostered Canadian competition at Bisley where the weapon had scored notable successes. But above all it had been a Canadian weapon and Hughes was convinced that the main opposition to its retention came from the same British Army contractors whose refusal to supply Canada with Lee-Enfields in 1902 subsequently had compelled us to manufacture our own rifle.<sup>25</sup> Similarly the wholesale condemnation of Canadian transport on the eve of the First Division's departure from England for France seemed to be a belated insistence on standardization after years of patronizing neglect and was therefore strongly resented by the Minister.<sup>26</sup>

In spite of acquiescence in British selection of a commander, G.S.O.1 and A.A. & Q.M.G. of the First Division, the Minister and his advisers attempted close control over the overseas force both from Ottawa and on periodic visits to the theatre of war. The form of this control was a matter of domestic debate which ultimately led to Hughes's resignation, but there was no dispute about the principle of direct communication between Ottawa and the force commander or the Minister's representative in Great Britain at the time.<sup>27</sup> This was a disagreeable novelty to the War Office, although in the Second World War the principle involved was taken for granted.

One of the important revelations of Canada's initial efforts was her capacity to make shells. The establishment of a Shell Committee as early as September, 1914 to organize the manufacture in Canada of shells to British order was the sort of triumphant improvisation in which Sam Hughes revelled. At the time the fabulous shell expenditure of 1916 was undreamed of and British Ordnance made every conceivable difficulty about accepting Canadian basic steel where acid steel was specified. The Shell Committee with the enthusiastic support of the Minister suc-

<sup>24</sup>Duguid, *Official History*, I, 12.

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*, Appendix 111.

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid.*, I, 146 and Appendices 219-22.

<sup>27</sup>*Ibid.*, I, 128-9.



ceeded in satisfying the most rigid tests and colonial industry was perforce admitted to the charmed circle so long associated with Woolwich without recourse to purchasing in the United States. In the struggle to maintain the Canadian character and identity of this important body, which more and more claimed the attention of the Ministry of Munitions in Great Britain, very sharp differences of opinion developed between the Minister and Lord Rhondda. These resulted in the replacement of the latter by Lionel Hitchens who was able to rely successfully upon the comradeship of the South African War in his dealings with Sam Hughes. The anomalous position of the Shell Committee, at once a Canadian government creation and an agent of the British Ministry of Munitions, was regularized by the end of 1915 when its functions were taken over by the Imperial Munitions Board. The Committee had been responsible for the procurement of twenty-two million shells since the beginning of the war. The achievement was marred, however, by the bitter attack made upon the Committee and its creator, Sir Sam Hughes, by large sections of the Canadian press, and its valuable contribution to the self-sufficiency of Canadian industry was only recognized long after the war was over.<sup>28</sup>

Examples of Sir Sam's vigilant interest in the independent action of the Canadian government can be multiplied almost indefinitely. None reveals more acrimony than his condemnation of the V.A.D. hospitals in Great Britain in which Canadian wounded were frequently placed and which received the strongest censure in Colonel Herbert A. Bruce's famous report. Instances of neglect and insufficient training to the prejudice of wounded men provoked ungallant outbursts from Hughes and deep dislike in the hearts of many noble ladies in England. But in spite of Sir Andrew MacPhail's official efforts, the principle of segregating Canadian wounded was also taken for granted in the Second World War. All these instances of friction, in which Hughes invariably maintained the equal voice of the Dominion, are so many examples of the practical difficulties in the path of the exponents of Imperial Federation. In 1916 as in 1904 he adhered to his belief that an imperial parliament should be responsible for foreign affairs, international trade, and war, while the existing bodies confined themselves to local matters. But the emphasis had changed:

A Dominion which sends to a European war an army immeasurably greater than the allied armies sent to the Crimea cannot again have the issues of peace and war determined for her by a government in which she is not represented. This I may say in full confidence of the righteousness of the British cause and naturally with full approval of the action taken by the British Government in going to war. Some solution however must be found for the situation in which we find ourselves.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>28</sup>David Carnegie, *The History of Munitions Supply in Canada 1914-18* (London and Toronto, 1925), I, 115.

<sup>29</sup>Sir Sam Hughes, "Canada's Future within the Empire" in E. A. Victor (ed.), *Canada's Future* (Toronto, 1916), 11.

Sir Robert Borden, with a more methodical and speculative intelligence, sought the solution in the war-time improvisation of the Imperial War Cabinet; but the post-war political leaders of Canada turned their footsteps in the opposite direction. With the single exception of the Ottawa agreements of 1932 so bitterly assailed by Mr. Mackenzie King, whose cherished atavism has played a vital part in latter-day imperial relationships, the Canadian government has moved steadily towards the constitutional dissolution of the British Empire. Hughes and his friends rightly rejected the policy of deliberation without decision and expected much from the compulsion of comradeship in war, but the forces arrayed against imperial ideas were too strong for them.

It has been said rightly that the Borden Government stood ever in advance of public opinion during the First World War,<sup>30</sup> an effort which brought measureless misfortune upon the once paramount Conservative party. Few members of that Cabinet have lived in the public memory as long as Sir Sam Hughes, who left it in 1916 a physical and political casualty of the war which he had descried. Few Canadians have so fiercely proclaimed the nationhood of Canada even within the purlieus of Whitehall. None have sought more earnestly for the practical realization of the imperial dream now farther away than ever in an infinitely more dangerous world. He was a man whose zeal was at once animated and frustrated by an abnormal egotism and in whose mind the sense of imperial greatness warred continuously with that of national pride. His achievement was essentially democratic, and more modest than his vision. The verdict of a large part of his countrymen may be expressed in the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier who is reported to have said, "He has done more in his day and generation for the upbuilding of the Militia of Canada and the Empire than any other man."<sup>31</sup>

#### DISCUSSION\*

*Colonel Stacey* said that all these three excellent papers had been given by men to whom he was personally indebted for aid to his Historical Section. Colonel Jackson had been in charge of war diaries overseas and the Section was now continually finding the extent of its indebtedness to him for his work. He was now in charge of war service records at the Department of Veterans Affairs and was again of great help in producing the statistics which the Historical Section desired to use. Colonel Jackson was a deep student of the wars of the eighteenth century. Colonel Stacey hoped that future programmes would include more non-professional historians.

He went on to say that Major Lamontagne had been head of the Army Translation Bureau before coming to the Royal Military College. He had translated Colonel Stacey's book on the Canadian Army. In this paper he was opening up a forgotten chapter in Canadian military his-

<sup>30</sup>Lucas, *The Empire at War*, II, 17.

<sup>31</sup>Hughes, "Canada's Future," 10 n.

\*These comments represent the discussion of the papers by Colonel Jackson, Major Lamontagne, and Colonel Hughes.



tory. Colonel Stacey noted with interest the connection between the Zouaves and the militia.

Colonel Stacey said that Colonel Hughes had been a member of the Historical Section. He hoped that his paper would be expanded into a fully documented book.

*Mr. Soward* said that Mr. Hughes had caught the spirit of Haliburton which he himself knew because he was born there. Sam Hughes had won the personal esteem of the people of the district which was his stronghold, but most of them knew nothing at all about his views on Imperial Federation. Sir Sam had had an extraordinary memory for people and faces. His great trouble was that he could never separate his enthusiasm as a soldier and his work as a politician and this seriously limited his position. It is noticeable that, faced by problems of federating the Empire, he at once put national interests first and imperialism second. This happened with all Canadian imperialists who had to deal with Imperial statesmen in London. Mr. Soward said that he disagreed with Mr. Hughes's statements about Canada's present course. He felt that we have taken the right course in post-war policy.

*Dr. Lower* said that Major Lamontagne and Mr. Hughes had both drawn attention to forms of imperialism. He said that Mr. Hughes had revealed a real distinction between Toryism and imperialism in Canada. In his opinion Canadian Tories had a nostalgic view of the past while imperialists were and are people whom the present scene never satisfies. The latter desire to be more important than they are and so they seek larger fields to conquer. In Major Lamontagne's paper the imperialists were those for whom the local scene was too small. They acted not so much from devotion to the papal see as in an attempt to transcend a petty localism. The Vatican has always been the metropolis of some French Canadians just as London has been the metropolis of certain English-speaking elements. He wanted to know whether an immersion in Rome affected French Canadians as contact with London affected English Canadians. Did it arouse a Canadian nationalism in the breasts of French-Canadian priests who went to Rome?

*Major Lamontagne* said that there was a difference between the two forms of imperialism which Professor Lower thought were the same. The Zouaves went to defend the Pope who was attacked by Garibaldi. They had a religious motive. He emphasized the fact that they paid their own expenses.

*Mrs. Wright* said that the Virginia Rangers were an important factor in the formation of the Queen's Rangers. Rogers was one of the creators of the idea of the Veterans of Foreign Wars because he asked for a huge slice of New Brunswick for his militia before he raised them.

*Colonel Jackson* agreed with Mrs. Wright about the origin of a movement from New Brunswick to Upper Canada which she had shown to have been begun by Rogers. He added that the second regiment of Queen's Rangers were artisans, who did such important building as that of Fort York and certain roads around Kingston.



## LAMARTINE ET LA JEUNESSE REPUBLICAINE DU CANADA FRANÇAIS EN 1848

SÉRAPHIN MARION

LAMARTINE et la jeunesse républicaine du Canada français ! Pareille juxtaposition surprend et semble même une gageure. Les historiens des lettres canadiennes n'ignorent pas l'influence *littéraire* de Lamartine sur la jeunesse canadienne, vers le milieu du siècle dernier : de tous les grands romantiques de France, c'est bien lui qui a le plus retenu l'attention de nos pères. Tout a été dit sur le christianisme diffus et le panthéisme vaporeux qui caractérisent l'œuvre lamartinienne. Comme Chateaubriand d'ailleurs, le poète de Milly n'a jamais eu l'intention de faire de l'apologétique. Mais comme son illustre prédécesseur, le Lamartine de la première manière aimait orienter les âmes vers l'au-delà et les conduire insensiblement au vrai par l'intermédiaire du beau. Les *Harmonies* de Lamartine sont-elles autre chose qu'un cantique de la créature au Créateur, un commentaire musical du texte des Livres saints : *coeli enarrant gloriam Dei* ? Est-il besoin d'observer que cette poésie religieuse et spiritualiste ne pouvait manquer de plaire infiniment aux Canadiens français si attachés à leur foi ? Ils eurent tôt fait de reconnaître dans ces *Méditations* et ces *Harmonies* des sentiments et des impressions conformes à leurs convictions de croyants. Enfin l'atmosphère littéraire se renouvelait depuis l'érotisme d'un Parny et les propos d'alcôve d'une Chloris ! La poésie quittait l'air vicié des boudoirs et des salons pour planer sur les sommets de la méditation et de l'extase. Nos pères s'en félicitèrent, ceux du moins qui lurent Lamartine sans opinions préconçues.

En 1848, Lamartine devient la coqueluche des salons québécois et montréalais. Cette année-là, il se vend même à Québec, chez J.-B. Corribeau, au numéro 9 de la rue Buade, des chapeaux à la Lamartine, « chapeaux brodés de velours et faits sur les corps d'étoffe de la première qualité »<sup>1</sup>.

Mais jusqu'à ce jour, nul n'a signalé — et pour cause — l'influence *politique* du poète sur nos ascendants en général, et sur nos républicains en particulier. Comment la vedette de la Deuxième République, qui avait trop de fers au feu, en 1848, aurait-elle eu le loisir de s'attarder dans les méandres politiques du lointain Canada ? Influence littéraire, soit ! Seuls les amateurs de mystification oseraient admettre une autre espèce d'influence.

Il ne faut jurer de rien : souvent ce proverbe trouve, dans l'histoire, des applications opportunes. Pour le moment, acceptons sous bénéfice d'inventaire l'hypothèse d'un Lamartine soutenant un certain rôle politique au Canada français et feuilletons nos anciens journaux de 1848.

La Révolution de 1848 secoua la France. Pendant plusieurs années après l'avènement de la Deuxième République, les répercussions de cet événement se firent sentir en Europe et en Amérique. Le gouvernement

<sup>1</sup>*Le Canadien*, 29 mai 1848.

français devint alors le point de polarisation des efforts de tous les libéraux dans l'un et l'autre monde. Les mots *liberté, égalité, fraternité* ensorcelaient de nouveau les âmes trempées au feu de plusieurs révolutions et patinées par des siècles de civilisation.

En Irlande, les langues se déliaient et les épées se dégainaient. Les journaux libéraux du Canada français ne manquèrent pas de consigner ce résultat avec une pointe de satisfaction. Même la *Revue Canadienne* traduit alors un extrait du journal intitulé *The United Irishman* et monte en épingle les phrases enfiévrées que voici :

Le jour de l'Irlande est enfin venu, grâce à Dieu et à la France. Son appel résonne à nos oreilles comme le cri de guerre et réchauffe notre sang comme le vin. Il faut nous unir, franchir toutes les barrières à l'exception de celles qui sont divines. Il faut plutôt mourir que laisser échapper cette heure providentielle sans obtenir notre libération. Le premier coup de canon que tirera l'Angleterre sera celui du soir qui annoncera le coucher de sa domination sur l'Irlande. Il ne s'agit pas de discuter le moment mais le moyen qui doit donner à l'Irlande son indépendance. Le temps approche, il vient avec le bruit d'une mer qui déborde ses rivages. Le peuple est-il prêt ? Il faut qu'il le soit, — aujourd'hui ou jamais. Concitoyens, levez la tête. Sortez de la poussière mortelle où vous dormez depuis si longtemps; ouvrez vos yeux à la lumière : Liberté, fraternité, égalité, qui luit d'un pôle à l'autre. L'acier brillant luira bientôt sur vos demeures désolées et le roulement du tambour du peuple chassera devant lui le nuage épais qui vous a caché la face du ciel. Surtout que tout homme qui n'a pas un fusil vende ses habits pour en acheter un.<sup>2</sup>

Entre-temps Lamartine délaissa temporairement les lettres afin de prêter main-forte à la naissante république. Le grand poète se métamorphosa en homme d'Etat. Nommé membre du gouvernement provisoire et ministre des Affaires étrangères, il rédigea une circulaire adressée aux agents diplomatiques de la France. Ce texte fut reproduit dans la *Revue Canadienne*, numéro du 7 avril 1848.

Le citoyen-ministre entendait bien montrer que l'avènement de la Deuxième République ne constituait aucunement un acte d'agression contre une forme quelconque de gouvernement dans le monde : la France désirait vivre en paix avec l'univers. Elle n'avait nullement l'intention de faire éclater, aux quatre coins de l'Europe et de l'Amérique, le tocsin libérateur : d'autres soucis retinrent son attention, au cours de sa vie éphémère. N'empêche que deux ou trois paragraphes de la circulaire durent éveiller des soupçons ou des inquiétudes dans les milieux anti-démocratiques et aviver les espérances patriotiques de certaines nations qui n'avaient pas encore toute leur place au soleil. Lamartine affirmait catégoriquement que la République française viendrait au secours de la Suisse si cette fidèle alliée « était contrainte ou menacée dans le mouvement de croissance qu'elle opère chez elle pour prêter une force de plus au faisceau des gouvernements démocratiques ». Quant à l'Italie, elle pouvait, elle aussi, compter sur la collaboration de la France pour établir et consolider son unité.

<sup>2</sup>*Revue Canadienne*, 4 avril 1848.



Bref, par la plume de Lamartine, la France promettait de ne pas provoquer la guerre civile chez ses voisins ; mais elle déclarait sa volonté incoercible « de ne jamais voiler la liberté au dedans, de ne jamais voiler son principe démocratique au dehors ». Elle se proclamait « l'alliée intellectuelle et cordiale de tous les droits, de tous les progrès, de tous les développements légitimes d'instruction des nations qui veulent vivre du même principe que le sien ».

Cette circulaire de Lamartine prenait donc figure de manifeste. Le grand poète embouchait le buccin en l'honneur des libertés démocratiques. Par ricochet, il invitait les petits peuples, encore en tutelle, à vivre leur vie propre. En somme, il donnait publiquement des lettres de créance au nationalisme encore timide et inquiet de sa destinée.

Plusieurs virent alors en Lamartine un docteur ès choses révolutionnaires. Car voilà bien l'extraordinaire aventure : loin d'exorciser ce texte de sa moindre signification tendancieuse, certains prirent ces généralisations au pied de la lettre et harcelèrent Lamartine d'inopportunes requêtes : entre la proclamation d'un principe et son application, il y a souvent la distance de la coupe aux lèvres.

Ce sont les Irlandais, semble-t-il, qui frappèrent les premiers à la porte de Lamartine. Le 3 avril 1848, une députation irlandaise, que dirigeait Smith O'Brien, obtint une audience au cours de laquelle furent soulignés les malheurs de l'Irlande et l'urgence d'une entreprise concertée pour permettre à ce pays de reconquérir son indépendance. Ces braves gens n'avaient tenu nul compte de la nécessité où se trouvait la France de vivre en paix avec la puissante Albion.

Lamartine accueillit fraîchement cette députation. Pour une fois, il ne fit pas tant de façons. Il admit sans ambages que la France nourrissait alors des sentiments amicaux à l'égard de l'Angleterre. « Nous sommes en paix et nous désirons rester en bons rapports non avec tel ou tel parti de la Grande-Bretagne, mais avec la Grande-Bretagne tout entière ! Nous croyons cette paix utile et honorable, non seulement pour la Grande-Bretagne et pour la République française, mais pour le genre humain. »<sup>3</sup> Lamartine, précurseur de l'Entente cordiale ; comme quoi les poètes sont quelquefois plus utiles à l'Etat que les joueurs de quilles !

Au Canada français, comme en Irlande, certains persistaient à réclamer l'avènement d'une république laurentienne : l'échec de l'insurrection de 1837 n'avait pas eu pour résultat de dissiper des illusions tenaces. *L'Avenir*, journal montréalais, s'était constitué bénévolement le porte-parole de cette minorité agressive.

Les modérés et les conservateurs firent couler des flots d'encre et de salive afin de contrecarrer une politique qu'ils tenaient pour intempestive ; quelques-uns de ces propos furent consignés, noir sur blanc, dans nos journaux et nos revues. Le style est rocailleux, mais la pensée ne prête le flanc à aucune équivoque.

Nous dirons une chose aux hommes généreux et dévoués de *L'Avenir*. Le moment est on ne peut plus mal choisi pour révolutionner

<sup>3</sup>Élie Halévy, *Histoire du peuple anglais au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1912-23), IV, 277. On peut aussi lire cet extrait dans la *Revue Canadienne*, 5 mai 1848.



le Canada. Nos idées et nos dispositions, convenons-en, ne sont pas à la guerre. Le peuple a été assez mal nourri de théories et par suite d'interminables batailles inutiles, avant l'Union, qu'aujourd'hui qu'il a le pouvoir en main (ce qu'il n'eut jamais alors,) qu'il voit les hommes qu'il a choisis le représenter dans les conseils de la Souveraine et de fait gouverner en son nom le pays, le peuple, disons-nous, trouvera fort mauvaise et passablement originale, étrange, fantastique, votre idée de vouloir renverser l'ordre de choses actuel pour le remplacer par la République une et indivisible ou quelque chose de plus merveilleux encore...

Nous parierions que nos compatriotes si admirateurs qu'ils soient de la Révolution Française préfèrent le gouvernement responsable avec sa perspective au gouvernement provisoire de Paris avec l'horizon sombre et menaçant qu'il présente. Nos compatriotes ne profiteront pas aujourd'hui des événements qui se passent en Europe pour faire un bouleversement sans trop savoir ce qui viendra après.<sup>4</sup>

Ces phrases hérissées de « qui » et de « que » véhiculent toutefois des idées claires : toutes s'opposent à l'établissement d'une république sur les bords du Saint-Laurent.

Afin d'abattre d'un seul coup les sept têtes de l'hydre républicain au Canada français, le rédacteur en chef de la *Revue Canadienne* eut une idée à la fois ingénieuse et impertinente. Sans en demander la permission à l'auteur, il osa se servir du nom du grand poète pour confondre les jeunes libéraux de Montréal. Quelle meilleure preuve de l'extrême popularité de Lamartine dans le Canada français de 1848 ?

Lorsque fut proclamée la Deuxième République, le 25 février 1848, quinze jeunes Canadiens français, républicains convaincus, en auraient profité, semble-t-il, pour adresser des félicitations à la « jeunesse gauloise ».

A ces félicitations, les quinze madrés compères, encore jeunes et partant audacieux, auraient inséré un vœu. Ils demandaient à la France républicaine de 1848 de prêter main-forte aux Canadiens français pour expulser les Anglais des bords du Saint-Laurent ! On ne connaît pas les noms de ces quinze braves. Étaient-ils des patriotes farouches, des condottieri, des spadassins ou simplement des enfants terribles ? N'oublions pas encore une fois que Lamartine, comme tous les membres du gouvernement provisoire de la France, courtisait l'Angleterre et ne demandait pas mieux que de vivre en bonne intelligence avec l'impératrice des mers et l'arbitre — alors souverain — des conflits internationaux. Voilà bien le piquant de l'affaire !

Le rédacteur en chef de la *Revue Canadienne* conçut alors l'amusante idée de fabriquer de toutes pièces la lettre que Lamartine est censé avoir adressée à la « jeunesse de la Nouvelle-France » en réponse aux félicitations décernées à la « jeunesse gauloise ». Document d'un certain intérêt pour les historiens, les littérateurs, les sociologues du Canada français : il atteste que les idées républicaines n'ont pas disparu chez nous, avec l'échec de l'insurrection de 1837; il témoigne, en outre, que le prestige

<sup>4</sup>*Revue Canadienne*, 18 avril 1848.

lamartinien s'exerçait, même au Canada, au delà des frontières de la littérature et de la poésie.

Sauf erreur, ce document est resté jusqu'ici enfoui dans la nécropole de nos anciens journaux. Il vaudrait d'être cité intégralement tant il est significatif. Contentons-nous de le résumer et d'en analyser quelques passages essentiels.

Impossible de s'y tromper : ces paragraphes n'émanent pas de la plume de Lamartine. Ils n'ont rien d'imprécis, de flou, de léger, de diaphane, de vaporeux. Bien au contraire, ils sont précis, satiriques, extrêmement réalistes, perspicaces avec un brin de taquinerie méchante. Lamartine écrivait souvent à la venvole; ici, il serait devenu puriste et il ne se gênerait nullement de donner, en passant, des leçons de bon parler aux jeunes Canadiens. C'est un Lamartine nouveau genre qui se serait ainsi révélé à nos arrière-grands-pères ainsi qu'à nos arrière-grand-mères. Mais, en 1848, plusieurs ont été dupes du procédé.

Cette réponse est datée de Paris, « Vieille France » : contraste voulu avec la « Nouvelle France » des destinataires. Elle commence par un double vocatif : « Citoyens ou Messieurs ». Enfin une note du rédacteur en chef de la *Revue Canadienne* explique que cette lettre de Lamartine, « reçue ce matin par la voie télégraphique de Troy et d'Albany », est mise immédiatement sous les yeux des lecteurs, « à l'exclusion d'autres matières préparées pour ce numéro »<sup>5</sup>. A n'en pas douter, Lamartine est déjà, pour nos pères, un grand personnage.

Le *citoyen* Lamartine apprend d'abord aux *citoyens*<sup>6</sup> ou *messieurs* canadiens que, en ce premier jour de mai 1848, deuxième mois de la nouvelle République, la révolution n'a pas encore terminé son œuvre. Le nouveau régime est tellement instable que madame Lamartine a cru opportun de passer momentanément en Angleterre. Grandes heures quand même que celles de 1848 : elles permettent aux Français de France de communiquer rapidement, par voie télégraphique, avec leurs cousins du Canada. Cette découverte comble une immense lacune. Mais écoutons ce pseudo-Lamartine : c'est ravissant !

Exposés comme vous l'êtes tous les jours, nous dit Charlevoix, aux attaques meurtrières des Iroquois, des Hurons et des Algonquins qui, à chaque semaine du mois, ont encore le privilège, comme anciens seigneurs de votre pays, de faire subir aux successeurs des Brébœuf et des Lallement le même sort que ces premiers apôtres du nouveau monde ont si cruellement éprouvé; c'est-à-dire que, d'après Charlevoix, dont le livre est la dernière *gazette* que nous ayons sur les affaires canadiennes, un jésuite est brûlé chaque semaine, tout vif, sur la place du marché public dans la cité de Montréal, capitale du Haut-Canada, étant située sur le lac Ontario, bien au-dessus du Fort Frontenac.

Dès le deuxième paragraphe, ce Lamartine truqué devient impertinent. Les quinze jeunes Canadiens avaient fait tenir à la jeunesse

<sup>5</sup>*Revue Canadienne*, 5 mai 1848.

<sup>6</sup>Entre jeunes montréalais, on s'appelait alors souvent « citoyen » gros comme le bras.



gauloise une *adresse* de félicitations. Le rédacteur en chef de la *Revue Canadienne* qui se dissimule sous le manteau de Lamartine ne prise guère le mot, s'il aime la chose. Devenu subitement pédagogue, il rabroue les quinze jeunes Canadiens qui écrivent dans un style *anglais*. C'est bientôt dit.

Enregistrons ici, au nom des jeunes Canadiens, une vigoureuse dénégation d'anglicisme. Si nous en croyons Littré — dont l'autorité en la matière vaut bien celle du rédacteur en chef — le mot *adresse* signifie écrit ayant pour objet une demande, une adhésion, une félicitation, etc., présenté par un corps constitué, par une réunion de citoyens. Evidemment *présenter des félicitations* eût plu davantage au censeur canadien. Mais, étant donné que l'adresse peut servir de véhicule à des demandes, à des adhésions, à des vœux et à d'autres choses encore, l'expression *adresse de félicitations* ne mérite pas les foudres de qui que ce soit. Comme tant d'autres écrivains, petits et grands, le rédacteur en chef de la *Revue Canadienne* voit des anglicismes là où il n'y en a pas. De toute façon, il n'y a pas là de quoi pendre ni un homme, ni quinze hommes, fussent-ils les quinze jeunes Canadiens de 1848.

Après cette remarque intempestive, le faux Lamartine arrive sans plus tarder au cœur même de l'*adresse*. Désirez-vous un modèle de bon sens politique où se glissent des aveux inquiétants et des soupçons de persiflage ? Alors lisez ce qui suit :

Vous voulez, dites-vous, jeunes *citoyens* ou *messieurs*, qu'avant trois ans, la République fasse le tour du monde, et que, dans sa course, elle envahisse le Canada; et vous paraissez (car vous ne le dites pas d'une manière bien claire) vouloir invoquer le secours de la France pour vous aider à chasser les *anglo-saxons* du territoire américain.

Il m'est bien pénible de vous faire éprouver un refus. D'abord la France n'est pas assez forte, quand même elle le voudrait, pour chasser les *anglo-saxons* du continent américain, ce qui comprend les vingt millions de la population des Etats-Unis; secondement, quant au Canada, si vous n'avez à craindre que les *Iroquois*, les *Algonquins* et les *Hurons*, il me semble que vous devez être, ou assez forts pour les vaincre, ou assez prudents pour ne pas leur livrer bataille, si vous vous attendez à une défaite.

Quelles que soient vos velléités, jeunes *citoyens* ou jeunes *messieurs* du Canada, la France ne peut pas venir à votre secours. Vous appartenez à un pays qui est une dépendance de l'Angleterre; eh ! bien, nous, qui représentons la « vieille France », nous désirons sincèrement rester en paix avec votre métropole.

N'oublions pas que, à quelques semaines de distance, en des termes identiques, ou peu s'en faut, Lamartine avait vraiment opposé à semblable demande d'une députation d'Irlandais la même fin de non-recevoir. Il était de bonne guerre, pour le rédacteur en chef de la *Revue Canadienne*, de prêter à Lamartine des propos qui ne contrastaient pas trop fortement avec ceux que le poète avait effectivement tenus à la députation irlandaise dirigée par Smith O'Brien.

Cette franchise plaît, même si elle est brutale. En 1848, la France ne pouvait venir au secours du Canada français. Mais, en 1914 et en 1939,



le Canada tout entier prêta secours à la France. De toute évidence, le rédacteur en chef n'a pas prévu cette double éventualité.

A son sentiment, il existe un autre motif de déconseiller la révolution aux Canadiens : ils jouissent d'un gouvernement responsable qui n'est pas pleinement accordé aux Français eux-mêmes. D'ailleurs « la plus belle des révolutions ne vaut pas le sang qu'elle fait couler ». Que les jeunes *messieurs* ou jeunes *citoyens* du Canada s'inspirent d'un pareil axiome, dans une « dépendance coloniale à peine connue en Europe ». Qu'ils n'imitent pas M. Papineau et ses disciples « qui, à cette époque [1839], se trouvaient d'autant plus près de l'échafaud que lui en était plus éloigné ». Surtout que les cousins de la Nouvelle France ne soient pas surpris d'une telle franchise. Ici le *citoyen* Lamartine — entendez le rédacteur en chef de la *Revue Canadienne* — apostrophe ses jeunes amis avec la morgue d'un aristocrate que la visite d'un manant importune :

Nous n'avons, pour ainsi dire, aucune communication avec le Canada. Si, lorsque vous êtes en paix avec les Iroquois, les Hurons et les Algonquins, vous publiez des livres, nous ne les recevons point. Les deux seules publications qui, dans les derniers temps, soient parvenues à notre connaissance, touchant les affaires du Canada, et qui m'ont été montrées l'autre jour, par mon ami M. Ledru-Rollin, sont deux espèces de pamphlets, l'un intitulé « Crise ministérielle » qui, pour moi est tout à fait inintelligible et mériterait à son auteur un voyage à « l'Azile »; et l'autre publié à Paris sous la signature de M. Papineau...

Environ un siècle plus tard, c'est-à-dire au cours de la deuxième guerre mondiale, le Canada français publia les manuscrits de quantité d'auteurs français qui avaient fui leur pays pour échapper à l'occupation allemande. Pour assurer la diffusion des ouvrages français aux quatre coins de l'univers, le Canada français vint à la rescousse de la France. C'est Montréal qui se substitua à Paris, lumière du monde alors mise en veilleuse. Etranges retours de l'histoire !

La lettre forgée se ferme sur un aveu triste pour un Français de France. Aveu qui, à lui seul, démontre la paternité canadienne de la prétendue « dépêche télégraphique ».

Quoique dépendance coloniale, vous êtes, permettez-moi de vous le dire, plus heureux que nous. Vous avez aujourd'hui le gouvernement responsable, c'est-à-dire, le vrai gouvernement représentatif; tenez vous-y. Vous, enfants de la France, abandonnés, jadis, par cette France elle-même, vous avez prouvé que vous saviez mieux jouir du gouvernement représentatif que votre ancienne mère-patrie ! Puissons-nous le comprendre aussi bien que vous l'avez compris vous-même !...

Puis, avec la propagation des principes anglais, la liberté de la presse doit devenir universelle. Elle existe déjà chez vous au plus haut degré; l'on ne peut en avoir une meilleure preuve que celle qu'a fournie la publication du « manifeste » de votre compatriote M. Papineau. Si le *citoyen* Thiers, ou le *citoyen* Odillon Barrot, avait osé faire publier un manifeste semblable, sous le gouvernement de Louis-

Philippe, et même sous celui qui lui a succédé, il y a vingt à parier contre un, qu'on l'aurait de suite conduit à Ste-Pélagie...

Encore une fois, vous Canadiens, nous vous félicitons d'avoir le « gouvernement responsable ». Nous qui sommes vos aînés, nous ne l'avons pas encore obtenu. Ne cherchez donc pas à changer de situation.

Soyez heureux, c'est le vœu sincère de votre,

Dévoué serviteur,

LAMARTINE.

Cinq Français de France ne surent pas flairer l'habile traquenard que leur tendait le rédacteur en chef de la *Revue Canadienne*. Dès le 8 mai 1848, ils s'empressèrent d'adresser une protestation au journaliste canadien qui, le lendemain, avec une parfaite désinvolture, la reproduisit dans sa feuille. Louis Letourneux — car c'est bien là son nom — rit sous cape et estima qu'il avait joué un bon tour à des Français de France. Mais lisons sans sourciller cette petite épître ampoulée.

MONTREAL, 8 mai 1848.

M. L.-O. LeTourneux,  
Rédacteur en chef  
de la *Revue Canadienne*

MONSIEUR,

Le nom de Lamartine est depuis longtemps un nom grand parmi les grands. La tâche pénible et glorieuse qu'il poursuit aujourd'hui, avec un si ardent et généreux patriotisme, lui a conquis l'une des plus belles pages sur les tables de l'histoire.

Profaner un nom si beau, si pur, si noble ! *au Canada*, n'est-ce pas un acte coupable à l'époque où nous vivons.

Aussi quand, dans l'intérêt d'une polémique, qui nous est *étrangère*, vous avez fait descendre dans l'arène, le nom de Lamartine, vous nous avez blessés profondément, comme français; notre cœur a saigné de douleur.

Protester, protester de toutes nos forces contre l'acte sacrilège que vous avez commis; c'est notre droit, c'est notre devoir, nous venons l'exercer.

En conséquence nous vous invitons Monsieur et vous requérons au besoin d'insérer notre lettre dans votre plus prochain numéro.

Nous avons l'honneur d'être,

Monsieur

Vos très humbles serviteurs.

PIERRE LAFARGE.

D. LATTE.

J. DENOURIEZ.

AUGUSTE REGNIER.

P. E. PICAULT.

Pas si bête, le rédacteur en chef de l'*Avenir* ne se laissa pas prendre au piège. Sans hésiter il attribua la paternité de la lettre à Letourneux et ne le lui envoya pas dire. A cette époque, les journalistes canadiens avaient rarement recours au procédé qui consiste à dissimuler une main

de fer sous un gant de velours : ils n'employaient, en somme, que l'encensoir ou la matraque. Quel coup de matraque Letourneux ne reçut-il pas, ce jour-là, d'un confrère dépité : « Pensez donc à l'antithèse, bon Dieu ! Lamartine et Letourneux ! Le génie et sa négation ! Une puissante et sublime intelligence, la pédanterie à figure humaine ! Le rat d'Egypte qui gruge la pyramide ! L'âne revêtu de la peau du lion ! »<sup>7</sup>

Ces folâtreries et ce batifolage réussissent mal à camoufler le fait évident que voici : même en 1848, c'est-à-dire une dizaine d'années après l'insurrection, le credo républicain compte plusieurs adeptes parmi la jeunesse libérale du Canada français. Afin de rabattre le caquet de ces jeunes « rouges », le rédacteur en chef d'un journal montréalais ne crut mieux faire que d'invoquer l'autorité de Lamartine par le truchement d'une lettre amusante, même si elle frise l'irrévérence, en jetant dans les méandres de la politique canadienne de 1848, sans lui en demander la permission, une des plus puissantes personnalités de la Deuxième République française. Aux yeux des républicains de Montréal, Lamartine devint sans doute un renégat et un traître qui pactisait, au Canada, avec les ennemis du peuple. Et l'illustre poète n'en sut jamais rien ! L'incident semblerait démontrer encore une fois que toutes les réputations, même les mauvaises, sont un peu usurpées.

#### DISCUSSION\*

*Mr. Rothney* asked what would have been Lamartine's reply had he known of the letter of the fifteen young men. Why were the young men dissatisfied with the responsible government which had been achieved? He believed that they had a genuine belief in democracy and thought that it had not yet been achieved. He added that the present Prime Minister traced back his political principles through Laurier to the Rouge party.

*Dr. Marion* denied that the present Liberal party derives from the Rouge party. Laurier made this clear in a reply to Beaugrand, editor of *La Patrie*, who claimed to have put Laurier in power. He distinguished between democracy and radicalism. Dr. Marion also added that Lamartine would have replied to the young men that France was not ready to make war in 1848 on their behalf. He admitted that the young Rouges should not be treated lightly. They were real democrats and had played a part in bringing democracy to Canada.

*Mr. Rothney* called attention to Laurier's membership in the Rouge party in his youth and suggested that he could not really disown all the Rouge traditions.

<sup>7</sup>*L'Avenir*, 10 mai 1848.

\*The above comments represent the appropriate part of the discussion at the session. At this time a paper was also given by Mr. Mason Wade on the subject "Quebec and the French Revolution of 1789." Mr. Wade's paper will appear in a forthcoming issue of the *Canadian Historical Review*.



## LE FORT FRONTENAC OU CATARAKOUI SOUS LE REGIME FRANÇAIS

ANTOINE ROY

*Archives provinciales, Québec*

IL serait téméraire de vouloir résumer, dans les quelques minutes à notre disposition, l'histoire du fort Frontenac sous le régime français. Son existence, fertile en incidents de toutes sortes, doit se placer dans les cadres plus vastes de l'existence même de la jeune colonie en pleine phase d'expansion et en butte à des difficultés administratives et militaires considérables.

Dès ses débuts, le fort Catarakoui, bastion avancé au seuil de la résidence d'une confédération de tribus depuis longtemps hostiles aux Français, devait être, en outre, l'objet du ressentiment et des convoitises de nos voisins les Anglais. C'est que ce poste représentait pour ces derniers l'entrave et la barrière au maintien et au prolongement d'un empire commercial déjà ébauché sur la même région.

C'est pourquoi le nom de ce fort fut directement lié à la bonne et à la mauvaise fortune de deux grands hommes : Frontenac, militaire accompli et clairvoyant, et La Salle, explorateur audacieux et infatigable. Et pour ajouter encore à la complexité d'un récit passable sur cet établissement, qu'il nous soit permis de mentionner que ce dernier fut, à travers toute son histoire, le sujet de controverses et d'intrigues entre des factions politiques et commerciales très puissantes.

Notre rôle ne sera cependant pas celui du chercheur scrutant à la loupe les moindres détails d'un tableau historique aux vastes dimensions. Tel le scénariste d'un film à court métrage, nous nous bornerons à mettre en scène les acteurs principaux et nécessaires, à relater les épisodes essentiels. Les décors seront très simples; l'action, résumée.

Personne n'ignore comment, dès les débuts de la colonie, la région des Grands Lacs devint le pôle d'attraction des explorateurs. Dès 1615, Champlain s'était aventuré jusqu'au lac Ontario. Et depuis, les coureurs des bois avaient sillonné la contrée en quête d'un gibier abondant et profitable. Ils rapportaient à Montréal et à Québec les récits légendaires des Indiens les assurant de l'existence d'un fleuve « qui arrosait des terres fertiles en or et en argent et qui coulait vers la Nouvelle-Espagne »<sup>1</sup>. L'esprit d'aventure et de lucre y trouvait son compte.

D'autre part, dès 1652, les missionnaires jésuites croyaient à l'opportunité de fonder des postes français dans la région des Lacs. Leur tâche en serait de beaucoup facilitée, ajoutaient-ils. La *Relation* de 1652 nous dit que les Iroquois eux-mêmes désiraient que les Français établissent sur le lac Ontario un « réduit, pour avoir le commerce libre, et pour se rendre maîtres de ce grand lac »<sup>2</sup>. Marie de l'Incarnation avouait à ses

<sup>1</sup>Pierre Margry (éd.), *Mémoires et documents* (Paris, 1874-88), I, 169.

<sup>2</sup>R. G. Thwaites (ed.), *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* (Cleveland, 1896-1901), XL, 219-21.

supérieures que déjà l'on parlait d'établir sur le même lac, un fort qui rendrait plus efficace le travail des missionnaires au milieu de plusieurs tribus importantes<sup>3</sup>.

Quelles étaient ces tribus ? Un historien anglais, MacKenzie, dans une courte étude sur Catarakoui, soutient que lorsque Cartier vint au Canada, les Hurons occupaient les environs de la rivière Catarakoui<sup>4</sup>. Ce n'est que lors des hostilités entre les tribus de la Confédération et les Hurons que ces derniers déménagèrent plus à l'ouest. Les Iroquois, politiquement très unis, et armés par les Hollandais dès 1636, établirent alors leur puissance militaire aux environs des Grands Lacs. Plus au nord vivaient les Outaouais, amis des Français et leurs pourvoyeurs en fourrures. Vers 1670, les choses se gâtèrent. Les Iroquois, agissant à l'instigation de leurs protecteurs, tentèrent de s'emparer du commerce des fourrures avec les tribus d'en-haut, et cela au détriment des Français.

Talon comprit immédiatement le danger dans lequel se trouvait le commerce français des pelleteries<sup>5</sup>. En 1670, il fit donc part au roi de ses appréhensions et lui suggéra l'érection d'un fort sur le lac Ontario. Mais Colbert préféra attendre. Plus tard, Courcelles avisa à son tour les autorités françaises, mais sans plus de résultats<sup>6</sup>.

Dès son arrivée au Canada, Frontenac vit la portée réelle du péril qui pesait sur la colonie. Le voisinage des Iroquois aux Grands Lacs n'avait, à cette époque, rien de rassurant. Il fallait donc gagner coûte que coûte l'amitié de ces chasseurs et guerriers formidables, rêvant de domination, capables en outre d'une action concertée et fatale à cause de leur grande unité politique. En établissant un poste permanent chez eux, il couperait la route aux Anglais et pourrait entretenir avec les Indiens des relations commerciales et militaires très avantageuses.

L'histoire proprement dite du fort débute avec le voyage de Frontenac au lac Ontario à l'été de 1673. Plusieurs historiens nous ont donné de cette expédition longuement méditée et préparée par le gouverneur, des relations élaborées. Nous dispenserons nos auditeurs des détails<sup>7</sup>.

Malgré les apparences toutes militaires d'une telle entreprise, Frontenac ne voulait qu'impressionner les Iroquois par un grand déploiement de force et de grandeur. N'était-il pas accompagné d'une partie de la garnison du Château Saint-Louis, de sa garde personnelle, de miliciens et d'un fort détachement de Hurons et d'Algonquins<sup>8</sup> ? Frontenac, précédé de La Salle comme messenger auprès des Indiens, fut ravi, dès son arrivée, de trouver à l'embouchure de la rivière Catarakoui un lieu pro-

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup>Charles Mackenzie, "Catarakoui" (*Ontario Historical Society, Papers and Records*, 1907, VIII, 142).

<sup>5</sup>Margry, *Mémoires et documents*, I, 82.

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, 181.

<sup>7</sup>Voir notamment : E. M. Faillon, *Histoire de la colonie française en Canada* (Paris, 1865-6), III, 461 et suiv.; Margry, *Mémoires et documents*, I, 198; Benjamin Sulte, « Le Fort Frontenac » (*Mémoires de la Société Royale du Canada*, Troisième Série, VII, Section I, 1901, 63 et suiv.); H. Lorin, *Le Comte de Frontenac* (Paris, 1895), 77.

<sup>8</sup>Faillon, *Histoire de la colonie française en Canada*, III, 461.



pice au dessein qu'il caressait : celui d'y établir un fort permanent. Il campa donc près d'une anse qui formait aux dires d'un témoin « un bassin des plus beaux et des plus agréables du monde puisqu'il y pourrait tenir cent des plus grands vaisseaux »<sup>9</sup>.

Durant plusieurs jours, le gouverneur parlementa avec les délégués des diverses nations venues à sa rencontre. Il les assura de ses bonnes dispositions à leur égard car, leur disait-il, il était venu pour établir avec eux des « relations de commerce et d'amitié ». Il leur demanda de répondre à ses désirs en « se rapprochant des Français de toutes manières, en se faisant instruire par les missionnaires dans leur langue et leur religion »<sup>10</sup>. Frontenac, grand diplomate et très averti de la mentalité de ses interlocuteurs, ne ménagea rien pour gagner leur sympathie et s'attirer un grand prestige personnel. Un chroniqueur de l'expédition nous le décrit « caressant les enfants,... leur faisant donner du pain, des pruneaux, des raisins et autres choses, ce qui satisfaisait tellement les sauvages qu'ils ne désesparaient point de sa tente, non plus que les femmes qu'il régalaient de présents pour les engager à danser le soir »<sup>11</sup>.

Pendant tous ces pourparlers et ces distractions offertes de part et d'autre, les membres de l'expédition ne restaient pas inactifs. Dès son arrivée, le comte avait chargé le sieur Randin de jeter les bases d'un fort. Après treize jours de travail ardu, on avait levé une palissade sur le terrain nouvellement défriché. A l'intérieur de cette enceinte close on avait bâti des baraquements pour y déposer vivres et munitions. C'était un fort très rudimentaire que devaient terminer durant l'hiver les ouvriers et la garnison laissés au poste sous le commandement de La Salle qui, durant les délibérations, avait servi d'interprète au gouverneur.

Frontenac revint à Montréal satisfait des résultats obtenus. Il venait de réussir par sa seule adresse et son habileté « ce que jusqu'à présent on avait tenu pour très difficile et que l'on s'était contenté de projeter ». Aussi, dès l'automne de la même année, le père de Lamberville écrivait à Frontenac que « si ce dernier n'avait pas en allant à Katarakoui gagné l'amitié des chefs indiens par sa libéralité et sa complaisance, il croyait que tous les Français d'Onandaga seraient à présent soit morts ou soit jetés hors du pays »<sup>12</sup>.

Vu l'état précaire du trésor de la France, alors engagée dans une guerre coûteuse avec la Hollande, Colbert avait approuvé avec assez mauvaise grâce l'établissement du fort Catarakoui. Il s'affirmait hostile à une expansion trop grande de la colonie vers l'Ouest et vers le Sud. Frontenac avait donc cédé provisoirement le fort aux sieurs Bazire et Le Ber, qui s'offraient à l'entretenir à leurs frais en retour de certains privilèges commerciaux<sup>13</sup>. Dès l'année suivante cependant La Salle, fort du patronage de Frontenac, traversait l'Atlantique et soumettait à la cour de France une pétition en vue d'obtenir personnellement la concession

<sup>9</sup>Margry, *Mémoires et documents*, I, 211.

<sup>10</sup>Lorin, *Le Comte de Frontenac*, 86.

<sup>11</sup>Margry, *Mémoires et documents*, I, 216.

<sup>12</sup>Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, LVII, 317.

<sup>13</sup>Lorin, *Le Comte de Frontenac*, 93.



du fort sur le lac Ontario. Pour la première fois, il appelait officiellement cette retraite : le fort Frontenac. Il obtint la concession demandée, devenant ainsi propriétaire et gouverneur de ce que Parkman qualifie « d'une des plus riches seigneuries de la colonie »<sup>14</sup>.

Mais ce privilège n'allait pas sans obligation. La Salle devait premièrement rembourser le roi des dépenses encourues lors de la fondation. Il devait, en outre, maintenir à ses frais une garnison égale à celle de Montréal dans un fort entièrement rebâti en pierre, et former des villages français et indiens aux alentours du fort. Naturellement, l'explorateur n'avait pas les fonds voulus pour effectuer d'aussi considérables déboursés et remboursements. Aussi dut-il — il le fera d'ailleurs à plusieurs reprises plus tard — emprunter de ses parents et amis sur la garantie d'une hypothèque sur les bâtiments du fort. A son retour de France et durant les deux années qui suivirent, La Salle s'employa à rebâtir, sur l'emplacement du fort démolì, un établissement plus vaste, entouré de remparts et bastions de pierre et de palissades de bois. Il fit placer neuf canons sur les murailles. L'enclos ainsi délimité contenait des baraquements en bois une habitation pour les officiers, une forge, un moulin et une boulangerie. A l'extérieur, La Salle fit ériger une chapelle et une maison pour les deux religieux récollets qui assurèrent dès le début et pour quelque temps le service religieux; ce furent les pères Luc Buisset et Louis Hennepin. La garnison du fort se composait de deux officiers, d'un médecin, d'une douzaine de soldats et de quelques ouvriers.

L'arrivée du gouverneur de La Barre au pays, en 1684, marqua le début d'une période de troubles et de détresse dans l'histoire du fort. Les controverses et les intrigues soulevées contre l'explorateur de l'Ohio par des factions commerciales adverses devaient l'emporter. Le parti ennemi eut d'abord raison de l'improbité et de la veulerie de La Barre. Ce dernier en effet, bien au courant des opinions du roi sur l'inutilité et les dangers de la politique d'expansion de La Salle, en prit prétexte pour s'emparer du fort et le livrer à deux marchands de Montréal, ses amis La Chesnaie et Le Ber. Il alléguait que La Salle n'avait pas rempli les conditions prévues dans l'acte de concession de 1674. Vraisemblablement, les nouveaux concessionnaires se montrèrent peu soucieux de cacher leur jeu. La Barre fut accusé de faire de gros bénéfices et de maintenir une garnison au fort, non pour faire la guerre aux Indiens, mais pour leur vendre de l'eau-de-vie. Ce qui faisait dire à Garneau que le gouverneur « apparemment contre le monopole travaillait pour lui-même et pour le commerce qui se faisait en son nom »<sup>15</sup>. La Salle n'eut aucune difficulté à faire reconnaître par la cour de France ses droits sur l'établissement. Les ordres du roi à La Barre furent catégoriques : il devait redonner à l'explorateur la propriété et obliger les marchands en question à rembourser les dommages et pertes encourues. La Barre fut vite rappelé. Denonville qui lui succéda avait décidé, comme on le sait, de mener une guerre d'extermination contre les Iroquois. Il devait malheureusement être leur victime et amener la chute temporaire du fort. Tout d'abord, le fort Fron-

<sup>14</sup>F. Parkman, *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West* (Boston, 1869), 101.

<sup>15</sup>F.-X. Garneau, *Histoire du Canada* (Montreal, 1882), 271.

tenac fut la scène d'une trahison qui « déshonora le nom français chez les sauvages ». Denonville se saisit de plusieurs chefs iroquois convoqués à l'ancien fort Cataracoui et les envoya aux galères du roi. Les divers incidents qui suivirent cette campagne néfaste montrèrent aux yeux de tous l'incapacité et la faiblesse de Denonville. N'alla-t-il pas jusqu'à céder devant les menaces des Indiens et à ordonner en secret la destruction du fort ? Valrennes, alors commandant au poste, dut obéir à ses ordres. Il mit partout le feu, jeta les canons à l'eau et coula trois vaisseaux<sup>16</sup>.

Frontenac était arrivé trop tard à Québec pour contremander l'œuvre désastreuse de Denonville. Mais, convaincu de la nécessité du fort pour amener les sauvages à se soumettre, il s'empessa d'envoyer un contingent de soldats et d'ouvriers le rétablir. Encore une fois, le gouverneur se trouvait en butte aux critiques de l'intendant Champigny et aux remontrances de la cour. Malgré tout, il sut faire accepter ses vues et conserva une garnison au fort. Son successeur, Louis-Hector de Callières, approuva d'ailleurs entièrement sa conduite et maintint et ravitailla le fort après la mort de Frontenac<sup>17</sup>.

Après la réconciliation officielle entre les Français et les tribus iroquoises, signée en 1700 par le gouverneur de Callières, le fort Frontenac perdit de son importance militaire. Il devint presque exclusivement un poste de commerce et de relai vers les forts qui se multipliaient à l'intérieur du continent avec la reprise des explorations. Ce fut alors un centre très actif. C'était en premier lieu le rendez-vous des marchands et des militaires venant de Montréal et de Québec ou y allant. Souvent ils y séjournaient quelque temps avant d'entreprendre leurs longues courses vers les prairies de l'Ouest ou chez les Illinois ou les Miamis. Le port attenant au fort servait encore d'étape aux nombreux convois de marchandises et de munitions que l'on expédiait vers la longue chaîne des postes disséminés à l'intérieur des terres. Et souvent ses hangars servaient d'entrepôts d'où l'on assurait la distribution en cas d'urgence. Le poste exerçait encore une fonction très importante. Ses ouvriers construisaient de temps en temps des vaisseaux qui étaient ensuite affectés à d'autres postes<sup>18</sup>.

La situation commerciale n'en était pas moins très peu florissante. Et l'on se plaignait souvent que le commerce des fourrures ne rapportait pas suffisamment pour couvrir les dépenses d'entretien. Les postes français situés plus à l'avant, ceux de Niagara et de Toronto par exemple, faisaient à Frontenac, situé à la périphérie de la région giboyeuse, une concurrence défavorable. Et ce qui est pis, avec l'établissement des nombreux postes d'échange anglais, les fourrures avaient repris le chemin d'Albany et de New-York. Les comptoirs d'Oswégo, sis en face du fort Frontenac sur la rive ouest du lac Ontario, attiraient beaucoup d'Indiens.

Les trafiquants français avaient encore à se plaindre des restrictions imposées par les autorités religieuses sur l'usage de l'eau-de-vie. Ils

<sup>16</sup>F. Parkman, *Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV* (Boston, 1877), 201-2.

<sup>17</sup>Margry, *Mémoires et documents*, V, lxxxii.

<sup>18</sup>Frank H. Severance, *An Old Frontier of France* (New York, 1917), I, 226.



menacèrent même à plusieurs moments de fermer leurs comptoirs. A coups de sacrifices, en donnant souvent les marchandises à perte, on maintenait quand même un commerce bien artificiel. Car il s'agissait de conserver, avec la traite des pelleteries, l'amitié et l'alliance des Indiens.

La reprise des hostilités militaires avec les Anglais devait donner au fort un regain temporaire d'activité. De part et d'autre, on comprit l'importance stratégique de ce poste. Dès 1755, les gouverneurs anglais, Shirley et Sharp entre autres, projetaient de déloger les Français des forts Frontenac et Toronto. Ils craignaient une attaque contre Oswego<sup>19</sup>. Détruire ces deux stations, songeaient-ils, ce serait du même coup amener la rupture des routes de secours et de ravitaillement vers l'Ouest et les Grands Lacs et provoquer l'évacuation des Français de ces régions.

De son côté, l'état-major français, sans doute au fait des desseins de l'ennemi, renforça la garnison du fort. Deux ingénieurs, Lombard des Combles et Desandrouins, y furent envoyés et firent exécuter certains travaux de réfection et de fortification.

En 1756, la marche contre Oswégo faisait partie du plan de campagne de Montcalm. Ce dernier, parti de Montréal, s'arrêta au fort Frontenac où il rencontra les régiments de Guyenne et La Sarre, de garnison à cet endroit depuis quelque temps. Il se les adjoignit et l'on connaît l'heureux résultat de son expédition contre les forts Oswégo, Ontario et George.

Mais déjà le sort du fort Frontenac était arrêté. Immédiatement après leur défaite à Ticondéroga, les Anglais décidèrent d'y envoyer le colonel Bradstreet. Le 25 août 1758, il débarquait ses quelques 3,000 soldats sur une île avoisinante. Le jour suivant, à la nuit tombante, il prit position près du fort qu'il canonna durant deux jours. Les quelque cent hommes qui assuraient le défense du fort répliquèrent bravement et mirent en action tous les canons. Ce fut en vain. Le 27, de Noyan, le vieux commandant du fort, devait lever le drapeau blanc de la capitulation. Les vaincus reçurent de Bradstreet la permission de garder ce qu'ils possédaient et un chroniqueur anglais nous dit qu'après « avoir été traités avec la plus grande civilité » ils furent laissés libres de chercher refuge dans d'autres postes français. Le commandant anglais n'ayant pas suffisamment d'embarcations pour les déporter au fort Oswégo, préféra les renvoyer sur parole. On rasa alors les murs et les bâtiments, brisa les canons en prenant surtout soin de détruire une quantité considérable de marchandises destinées au ravitaillement des postes de l'intérieur.

Clinton nous raconte qu'à la prise du fort, un missionnaire et plusieurs personnes s'étaient réunis dans une salle et priaient devant l'image de la Vierge. Un obus tomba près de la pièce, fit voler en morceaux les fenêtres et emporta l'image sainte. Les assistants se seraient alors écriés : « Mon Dieu, mon Dieu ! » Et le narrateur d'ajouter ironiquement : « tout était perdu, les hérétiques s'emparaient du fort »<sup>20</sup>.

Oui, en effet, tout était perdu. Les Français remettaient entre les mains de leurs ennemis la maîtrise des Grands Lacs et des régions qu'elles commandaient. La chute du fort marquait la fin du beau rêve de Fron-

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, II, 97, 133.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, II, 220-1.



tenac et de La Salle. Cet empire qu'ils avaient si crânement désiré, sans autres limites que celles de la mer et pour lequel ils avaient si arduement besoin, d'autres allaient en tirer bénéfice. Une chose cependant devait demeurer bien à eux, que ni la défaite militaire ni les siècles ne peuvent leur soustraire : la gloire d'avoir, au prix de contrariétés et de privations, donné à cette période de l'histoire d'une petite colonie un éclat dont s'énorgueillissent encore leurs descendants.

## HISTORICAL RESTORATIONS

RONALD L. WAY

*Ontario Department of Highways*

PRESERVATION of the historic monuments of the nation has long been recognized as a work of vital necessity. In the words of Joseph Howe, "A wise nation preserves its records, gathers up its monuments, decorates the tombs of its illustrious dead, repairs its great public structures and fosters national pride and love of country by perpetual reference to the sacrifices and glories of the past."<sup>1</sup> It is unfortunate, however, that many structures of the past that would be highly prized today have partially, or even wholly, disappeared. For these, apart from the mere preservation of such ruins as still exist, there is the alternative possibility of an historical restoration. Previous to the outbreak of the last war, Canada, and the Province of Ontario in particular, had become what might be called "restoration conscious."

The policy of rebuilding important historical structures, instead of simply preserving the existing remains, was already manifest on a considerable scale in the United States before making an appearance in Canada. Well known are the reconstructions of such famous sites as Williamsburg, the old colonial capital of Virginia, Fort Ticonderoga at the foot of Lake Champlain, and Old Fort Niagara, at the mouth of the Niagara River in the state of New York. The latter project held a special interest for Canadians and it is fitting that many of our countrymen were closely associated with the work of reconstruction. First French, 1678-1759, then British, 1759-96, and since then, American, the flags of all three countries had in turn floated from its ramparts and its story covers many important pages in the history not only of the Niagara frontier, but of the nations of France, Britain, the United States, and Canada. Old Fort Niagara was, from the completion of its restoration, extraordinarily successful in attracting tourists and this initial step towards the re-fortification of our so-called "undefended frontier" soon brought a demand for "reprisals" in this country.

By 1936, officials interested in the development of Ontario's tourist trade—already in the class of a major industry—had discovered hitherto unsuspected possibilities in the almost forgotten ruins of many historic sites within this province. The coincidence of a policy of government-sponsored projects for the relief of unemployment during the depression and the new interest in historic sites as an aid to the tourist trade resulted in the Ontario government taking active measures, between 1936 and 1940, for the restoration of Fort Henry at Kingston, Fort George and Navy Hall at Niagara-on-the-Lake, Old Fort Erie on the Canadian shore of the Niagara across from Buffalo, and non-military sites such as the homes of William Lyon Mackenzie at Queenston and Joseph Brant at Burlington.

<sup>1</sup>J. A. Chisholm (ed.), *Speeches and Public Letters of Joseph Howe* (Halifax, 1909), II, 619-20.

In addition to Fort Henry, many of you have no doubt visited the restorations at Niagara and Burlington. As professional historians, most of you will have discovered in them some inaccuracies in detail; but I trust that, generally speaking, you have been more pleased than disappointed. I am, myself, aware of some unavoidable imperfections, the majority of which do not present themselves during a casual inspection. On the whole, I believe, perhaps not unnaturally, in view of my association with all of these undertakings, that the work has been successful to a high degree, possibly exceeding much that has been accomplished elsewhere along similar lines.

Whether or not you agree with this statement depends partly upon your interpretation of what is meant by a successful restoration. It is obvious that there are a number of standards by which the accomplishment may be assessed. Many persons will think of success only from the standpoint of the tourist attraction, but any example of the unusual, any monstrosity, will attract the curious, as Barnum and Bailey discovered long ago. The creation of employment during the great depression, with jobs for labour, skilled artisans, contractors, architects, and even one poor research historian, was undoubtedly a worthy enterprise and quite successful as far as this minority was concerned, but this is scarcely justification for the expenditure of large amounts of public money upon historical restorations in preference to other projects. From the historian's standpoint, however, let me suggest that the criterion of success really lies in the answer to this question. Can historical restorations assist not so much the advanced student, but the general public, in the appreciation of history?

It may interest you, as professional historians, to know something of the procedures followed in our reconstructions, of the problems encountered, of the imperfections that were unavoidable, and of the annoyances that were incidental throughout the course of the typical restoration. Obviously, the initial phase in the conduct of any historical restoration is the necessary research. Special problems are involved. The average author can get by with casual references to historic sites and buildings, leaving a great deal to his individual reader's imagination. For example, we are told that Brock, after his death at Queenston Heights, was first buried in the "cavalier bastion" at Fort George. It is extremely doubtful whether Lady Edgar, or, for that matter, any of Brock's other biographers, had a clear conception of what is meant by a "cavalier bastion." Yet, for the actual reconstruction of Fort George, it was imperative to uncover every detail in connection with the bastion referred to. What was its tracing? Was it a full or hollow bastion? Were there revetments? What was the cross-section of its ditch with the escarp, counterscarp, and glacis? Had it a berm, with fraising, and, if so, how wide? And again, what was the profile of the parapet with banquette, interior, superior, and exterior slopes? Indeed, merely to interpret the original plans, it was necessary to make a comprehensive study of the whole science of fortification as it stood at the latter part of the eighteenth century.



Broadly speaking, I believe that the cardinal rule for historical restorations should be "when in doubt about something, leave it out." Unfortunately, some features about which one may be dubious, such as the structure of a roof or foundation of a building, are impossible of omission. That is one way in which imperfections tend to creep in. I have often thought that the historian conducting research has a parallel in the astronomer studying the skies with his telescope. In the case of the moon, the astronomer can discern mountain ranges, valleys, and craters, but no matter how powerful the lens or how great the amount of time spent in observation his knowledge is definitely limited by the physical imperfections of the instruments at his disposal. The material with which a research student must work is likewise imperfect, limited to the records that have survived and can be discovered, either by archaeological investigations on the site, or by digging amongst manuscripts and plans in the depths of archives or libraries.

Manuscript sources are variable, depending upon the past importance of the site being restored and upon the fortune, good or bad, which influenced their survival. The great significance of Fort Henry as the Citadel of Upper Canada, together with its continuous use as a military post for almost eight decades, made the task of research less onerous than in the case of the Niagara forts, which were neglected and almost forgotten soon after the War of 1812. While knowledge gained through archaeological investigation is most often incomplete, it is certain as far as it goes and it serves to confirm or disprove the evidence of plans and manuscripts. Plans of buildings are invariably prepared before the structures themselves are erected, and in the absence of post-construction drawings of a later date, there is naturally some doubt as to whether actual construction followed the original plans in all details. For example, in the case of Fort George, some important plans are inscribed "*Works Proposed to be Constructed on the High Ground behind Navy Hall during the Year 1796.*" Yet, through archaeological investigation, it was possible to verify the actual construction of those works. An additional field of research might seem to lie in local tradition and the recollections of the oldest inhabitants of the area concerned. It has been my personal experience that this source of information is almost completely unreliable.

In every restoration with which I have been associated, the initial objective of research has been the preparation of a comprehensive report, designed to be of practical assistance to the authorities concerned in the solution of basic problems. Let me cite an example. Perhaps the most important decision connected with the restoration of Fort George was choice of the period in its history to be represented by the reconstruction. The first fort had opposed the Americans in the War of 1812. There, General Brock, the hero of Upper Canada, had his headquarters, and there he was buried after his death in the battle of Queenston Heights. The second Fort George, constructed by the Americans and afterwards garrisoned by the British for only a short time, was never actually attacked and had few historical associations for Canadians. For these reasons, it was decided that Fort George might best be restored to its

original state, as built by the orders of Lieutenant-Governor Simcoe between 1796 and 1799.

When the report was completed and basic decisions were made, my association with a typical restoration entered upon a new phase. In the preparation of working drawings, I was an associate of the architect and my practical knowledge of draughtmanship was not amiss. Later, when contracts were let and the construction commenced, I found myself functioning as an "historical supervisor," with everlasting problems.

A successful restoration could only result from the close co-operation of the government, the architect, the contractor, and the historian, but specialized training had given to each of these a particular viewpoint. Government officials, responsible to the electorate of this province, were interested in securing permanent assets in return for the expenditure of Crown funds. While the architect was indispensable in the preparation of working plans and in the effective supervision of contracts, he had, perforce, to restrain his creative instincts and content himself with the role of mere copyist for in historical restorations there is little scope for improvements beyond the ken of the original builders. On the other hand, modern contractors, specialists in efficient production, struggled to comprehend the necessity of cruder and more laborious methods of construction, solely for the attainment of authentic effects. The historian, for his part, is inclined to be both oblivious to costs and adamant in his insistence on authenticity, even in minor things completely concealed from the public eye. When serious but inevitable differences of opinion arose, compromise was the only practical expedient.

At the time Fort George was originally constructed, boards were sawn from logs by hand and bore the distinctive parallel markings of the whip-saw, in unmistakable contrast to the modern product scored with the curved lines of the circular power-saw. At modern costs, the expense of producing entirely by hand the enormous quantities of boards required for the reconstruction was entirely prohibitive. Our practical compromise was to cut all visible boards by hand, utilizing a saw-pit especially constructed for the purpose. Concealed construction, such as the sills and joists of lower floors, was produced by modern methods. Again, the pressure application of creosote as a wood preservative is an essentially modern practice, but, since its use promised permanence to timber stockades and revetments, the departure from authenticity seemed more than justified.

Every construction project, large or small, would seem to have its self-appointed critics. Removal of a tree, approximately 75 years of age, to facilitate the restoration of a bastion dating back more than 150 years, led to public accusations of vandalism. The second Fort George had been superimposed upon the original British fort and the outlines of the former were readily traceable at the commencement of our work. As the remains of the American fort disappeared and the shape of the reconstructed British fort emerged, local antiquarians became most eloquent in questioning the authenticity of the reconstruction. Efforts to convince them of the accuracy of any evidence antedating the recollections of the



oldest living inhabitants resulted only in frustration. Even here at Kingston, to this very day, there are residents who firmly believe that Fort Henry was built the wrong way around, documentary evidence to the contrary.

While factors beyond his control may compel the historian to accept some compromises, I am convinced that he may rest happy if the general effect, the atmosphere, or the illusion—call it what we will—of authenticity has been created. If, in spite of the shortcomings and imperfections, of which he alone may be aware, there is a convincing over-all effect, one may experience that satisfaction the ancient armourer must have had when the sword of his manufacture rang true. It is a clear case of the whole being greater than the sum of the parts thereof. The objective has been achieved if the reconstructed site inspires in the beholder a sense of the past, a feeling impossible of analysis but very real nevertheless, and never so strong for me as when viewing Fort Henry by moonlight, with the lanterns burning by the drawbridge.

When the task of restoration had been accomplished, the problems of exhibition and management were added to my work of historical supervision. Although Fort Henry today has the appearance of an impressive fortress, bristling with mounted cannon and defended by glacis, ditch, drawbridge, caponnière, reverse fires, flanking towers, and all the paraphernalia of early nineteenth-century fortification, it is really a museum piece. A restored structure with empty, untenanted rooms would have less interest for the average visitor than if its interior space were utilized for the exhibition of historical objects. In the case of Fort Henry and the Niagara forts, certain rooms were refurnished as they might have been when occupied by British soldiers of more than a century ago. Because pursuit of this policy beyond a certain point leads to needless duplication and a monotonous effect, it was decided to use surplus space for the display of appropriate museum pieces. It is almost an axiom that the small museum must specialize, and here at Fort Henry we have concentrated upon separate collections of infantry, cavalry, artillery, and naval arms and equipment. Much of the material in the naval museum is especially interesting, having been salvaged from the wrecks of the war vessels of 1812 which lie sunk in Dead Man's and Navy Bays. The museum at Fort Erie includes a unique collection of buttons, regimental badges, and buckles, and even the leather of shoes that the soldiers wore, all excavated from the ruins during the restoration. Among grim mementoes of the siege are bayonets bent in fantastic shapes by the explosion of the north-east bastion. To explain to visitors the story of the heroic siege, a large-scale model illustrates the British and American fortifications. In addition there has been assembled martial equipment of the period and a superb collection of military prints.<sup>2</sup>

Beyond the rehabilitation of the historic structure and its use as a repository for suitable museum material, it is my conviction that an effi-

<sup>2</sup>In the establishment of museums, local organizations can render valuable assistance and Fort Henry owes much to the Kingston Historical Society and the untiring efforts of its President, Lieutenant Colonel C. M. Strange.



cient guide service is essential if the full significance of the restored site is to be conveyed to the general public. There is nothing singular in the mere provision of a guide service; but at Fort Henry there has been initiated a procedure which is perhaps unique. To enhance the atmosphere of the past, our guides are carefully trained and uniformed as Imperial troops of a century ago. Known as the "Fort Henry Guard," they are, ostensibly, a part of another age, in keeping with the limestone walls, the drawbridge, and the formidable cannon. The personnel of the Guard are, for the most part, university students, many of them being veterans of World War II. Indeed, the service ribbons of that conflict are the only anachronism in their equipment! Notable occasions, such as the visit of the Canadian Historical Association, are observed by the Guard with exhibitions of foot and arms drill, including the traditional *feu de joie* and the firing of salutes with the Fort's century-and-a-half old muzzle-loading cannon, employing the drill and equipment laid down in the text-books of the period. It may be argued that all this involves unnecessary expense, but I firmly believe that the Guard is the spirit of Fort Henry and is the greatest single factor in creating an illusion, an illusion of the past restored to life.

From the historian's standpoint, the justification of the government's work in rehabilitating such important structures as Fort George, Fort Erie, and Fort Henry, instead of merely preserving the unintelligible ruins, is that these restorations constitute a significant contribution to the teaching of Canadian history and to its general appreciation. When it is possible to associate the story of some past event with the actual location where it occurred, when the story of a battle can be related upon the actual ground where it was fought, the topographical surroundings, surviving trenches, or other remains are all a stimulus to the feeling of reality. This stimulus is even greater when, by crossing the antique drawbridge of a fort, the visitor finds himself, to all appearances, among the authentic surroundings of another age. The effort of imagination required to secure a sense of the past is thus reduced to a minimum that is within the capacity of every normal person. It is a visual teaching of history. The true value and justification of the Ontario government's policy with respect to historical restorations is that these constitute a very real aid in transmitting to many thousands of persons a true sense of history, which is, in reality, as much a feeling or state of mind as it is the scientific accumulation of facts. If we concede that preservation of historical tradition is the very basis of nationality, it is to the lasting credit of the government of this province that, through a programme of historical restorations, it is contributing in no small measure to the development of patriotism and of the highest qualities of Canadian citizenship.

## THE HONOURABLE RICHARD CARTWRIGHT

JAMES A. ROY  
*Queen's University*

THERE are many personalities in the history of a nation whose names are obscure, perhaps even unknown to the wider public, but who played on their own small stage a part greater than they realized at the time, and which can only be understood in the perspective of the years. In our own nation of Canada there have been many such individuals, who started with small beginnings, laid small foundations, and built better than they knew. The nation was formed originally from small communities. It is the men who fashioned these communities who fashioned the nation. In the early history of Canada Kingston played a significant part. It was the key city in the early period of the Province of Upper Canada, the nucleus of the English-speaking portion of this dominion. The Honourable Richard Cartwright, in playing a great role in the creation of the Kingston community, made a contribution to the history of Canada which has inevitably not received much attention from our national historians but which is well worth recalling.

Richard Cartwright Jr. was born in Albany, N.Y., in 1759. His father was a successful business man and it was from him that young Cartwright inherited the ability which made him one of the merchant princes of early Canada. In his youth the son wished to enter the ministry of the Church of England;<sup>1</sup> but the American Revolution blocked this aspiration and led him to become, instead, the military secretary of Colonel Butler of the Rangers.<sup>2</sup> After the cessation of hostilities he came with his parents who had fled with the Loyalists to Canada and as there was no organized episcopal church there he found his ambition once more thwarted. While he was attempting to solve the problem of his future he met James McGill in Montreal and this led him to turn from the church to commerce for a career.

James McGill was a Glasgow Scot who had emigrated to Virginia and moved north when the Canada Act of 1774 restored to Quebec the furbearing Indian territory which had been severed from Canada in 1763. He had prospered greatly and had become one of the original partners in the North West Company. To Cartwright, fourteen years his junior, he took an immediate liking and advised him to go into business. There was, he said, an excellent opening for a pushing young man on Carleton Island, between Wolfe Island and the American mainland. The island was not only the headquarters of the British marine establishment on

<sup>1</sup>"A misfortune which had befallen him early in life assisted in leading him to this determination. A boy, in playing, struck him with a stone in the left eye, which deprived him almost entirely of its use." From "Life of Hon. Richard Cartwright Abridged from Funeral Sermon by Rev. John Strachan" in C. E. Cartwright (ed.), *Life and Letters of the Late Hon. Richard Cartwright* (Toronto, 1876), 11.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, 29 ff. Memorandum of Indian operations from 1778 to 1780, made at Niagara in 1780.

Lake Ontario, but there was also a small military garrison at Fort Haldimand. There was another military outpost at Cataraqui,<sup>3</sup> to which a number of workmen, wheelwrights, and masons were attached, with their families. The place was bound to grow. Cartwright, realizing that opportunity was knocking at his door, took McGill's advice, and in partnership with McGill's old friend, Robert Hamilton,<sup>4</sup> he opened a store on Carleton Island. This was the beginning of a friendship which lasted until Hamilton's death in 1809.

When Carleton Island was declared American territory the British got ready to move out, and by the end of 1783, or the beginning of 1784, the Hamilton-Cartwright business had been transferred to Kingston. A warehouse and a wharf were built close to Fort Frontenac where the La Salle Causeway begins.<sup>5</sup> Hamilton concentrated on the Niagara peninsula while Cartwright attended to the Kingston end of the business. He got permission to build two frame houses, one for himself and his young wife, Magdalen Secord, a Niagara girl,<sup>6</sup> and the other for his parents. About 1790 the partnership was dissolved by friendly mutual agreement, Hamilton going to Queenston and Cartwright remaining in Kingston.

Cartwright had many interests. He represented the North West Com-

<sup>3</sup>The Mohawks knew the district as Kataracoui, which was also their name for the St. Lawrence River. From 1673, when Count Frontenac built his first fort on approximately the site of the present Tête-de-Pont barracks, until 1758, it was Fort Frontenac. In that year the fort was taken by Bradstreet and demolished. See [E. C. Kytel], *Impartial Account of Lieut.-Col. Bradstreet's Expedition to Fort Frontenac* (Toronto, 1940). (The *Account* was published in London in 1759.) Then the district became Cataraqui again. In 1784 the Loyalists called the settlement Kingstown, which was officially shortened to Kingston by John Collins, the Deputy Surveyor of the district. Samuel Holland, the Surveyor-General of Quebec and Director of Surveys in British North America, refers to "Fort Haldimand at Cataraqui," but the name was not adopted.

<sup>4</sup>The Honourable Robert Hamilton (1750-1809), "an accomplished gentleman of genial disposition and manner" (Agnes Maule Machar, *The Story of Old Kingston* (Toronto, 1908), 70). Hamilton was a member of the Land Board and of the Executive Council. Much of the business correspondence between Hamilton and Cartwright is contained in the Cartwright Letter Books in the Douglas Library, Queen's University, Kingston, and in a volume of letters in the possession of Henry Cartwright, Esq., barrister, Kingston. See, too, H. F. Gardiner, "The Hamiltons of Queenston, Kingston and Hamilton" (Ontario Historical Society, *Papers and Letters*, VIII, 1907). One of the sons of the Honourable Robert, George, gave his name to the city of Hamilton, Ont.

<sup>5</sup>The original log store remained standing until June, 1950, when it was demolished. Few people were aware of the age or historical significance of this building.

<sup>6</sup>The marriage took place at Niagara. By English law a marriage was irregular unless performed by a priest or deacon episcopally ordained and the children were consequently illegitimate. Three of Cartwright's children were legally illegitimate. This explains the fervour with which he advocated that the Marriage Act should be amended. "The Marriage Act was necessary, and is useful as far as it goes, but it is defective in omitting to make provision for the marriage of Dissenters; and every effort will be made at the next meeting of the Legislature to put this business on a more liberal footing." Cartwright Letter Books, Cartwright to Todd, Oct. 14, 1793. Isaac Todd, Esq. of Montreal, was at one time a partner of the Honourable James McGill.



pany for a time, ran a shipyard, and built his own ships. He leased the government mills at Catarqui Falls (Kingston Mills) as well as those on the Apanee River.<sup>7</sup> When the naval establishment was transferred to Point Frederick opposite Kingston, he operated a scow ferry from his wharf for civilians who had business there and put his father in charge of it. He was active in civic affairs. He suggested that an official should be appointed to look after the poor, urged the need of a civic hospital, and pleaded that some provision should be made for the aged and infirm. He was largely responsible for getting the new Anglican church built and contributed generously to the building fund. He was a member of the Land Board and a justice of the peace; in 1788 he was appointed a judge of the Court of Common Pleas, which heard civil cases, and was nominated at the same time a justice of the Court of Quarter Sessions, which presided over criminal trials. He was then twenty-nine years of age.

The first "criminal" trial at which Mr. Justice Cartwright presided was of a case of alleged petty larceny which would have been disposed of today by a local magistrate. But at that time theft was a serious offence, punishable by death. The trial was held in Finkle's tavern, near Ernestown, because there was no suitable accommodation in Kingston. The case seemed simple enough. A farm hand acquired a new watch and showed it to some of his acquaintances. They were jealous, whispered among themselves, and presently the poor man was arrested on the charge of having stolen the watch. He swore he had come by it honestly, but no one believed him, and on purely circumstantial evidence he was convicted and hanged on a tree not far from the tavern. The verdict was protested in court but the citizen who ventured to object was hissed down and threatened with bodily harm. A few days later a pedlar plodded into the village with his pack, heard the story, and corroborated every word the dead man had said. Cartwright did not soon forget his first "criminal" trial.<sup>8</sup>

In 1790 he became involved in another disagreeable case. A certain

<sup>7</sup>Acting on instructions from Governor Haldimand, Major Ross, the first British military commandant at Kingston, had employed Robert Clark, millwright, who had been since 1777 a clerk and naval storekeeper at Carleton Island, to erect a grist and saw-mill at Catarqui Falls (Kingston Mills), for the use of the Loyalists. The mills were put up in the winter of 1783-4 and served the section of the country extending from Cornwall to the head of the Bay of Quinte. Settlers who wanted to have their grain ground had to carry it on their backs through the woods, or bring it by *bateau* or canoe in summer or by hand sleigh in winter. In 1785 Clark built another mill at Napanee on the Apanee or Appanee River. In 1789 the Honourable Richard Cartwright proposed to the Executive Council of Upper Canada that, as the Kingston Mills had served their original purpose, they should be granted as an endowment for the grammar school there. E. A. Young (ed.), *The Parish Register of Kingston 1785-1911* (Kingston, 1921), 34. Mrs. Simcoe visited the King's mills, also those at Napanee. See J. Ross Robertson (ed.), *The Diary of Mrs. John Graves Simcoe* (Toronto, 1911), 120, 270.

<sup>8</sup>The trial was held in Ernestown (Bath since 1812) because there was no proper courthouse in Kingston. It was not until 1795 that a committee was appointed consisting of the Honourable Richard Cartwright and two fellow magistrates, Messrs. Atkinson and Markland, "to contract for and superintend the building of a gaol and court house." *The Parish Register*, 34.

Charles Justin McCarty, an Irish American who had been converted to Methodism in Pennsylvania by George Whitefield, the English evangelist, came to Ernestown and began to preach. The curate of Fredericksburgh, a few miles away, the well-meaning but cantankerous Reverend John Langhorn, objected, and complained to his friend the Reverend John Stuart of Kingston who, as Bishop's Commissary, or representative, invoked the secular arm; and Richard Cartwright had to intervene. He had the evangelist arrested as "a vagabond, imposter, and disturber of the peace" and ordered him to be deported to Oswego. The rest is silence. Apparently McCarty was not sent to Oswego or anywhere else. He just disappeared and one of Kingston's mysteries remains unsolved. But people drew their own conclusions; they recalled the hanging at Ernestown and looked darkly over their shoulder at Richard Cartwright.<sup>9</sup>

Cartwright, however, stood high in the esteem of his fellow townsmen. He was favourably spoken of in higher quarters and when (a few days after his inauguration in the new Anglican Church) Upper Canada's first Lieutenant-Governor, Simcoe, met his Executive Council, in the tiny frame building which was called by courtesy "Government House,"<sup>10</sup> to issue writs for the election of members to his first Legislative Council, he named Richard Cartwright as Kingston's representative. Cartwright accepted the honour with some misgiving; he had domestic and business problems to think of. Besides, while he appreciated the Governor's many excellent qualities, he was afraid that his combination of rashness, obstinacy, idealism, and unrepentant English Toryism<sup>11</sup> would lead to an unhappy clash of opinions. He was right. When Cartwright submitted a bill to incorporate the town of Kingston and drew up what we would term a plan for Public Utilities, the proposal was summarily rejected. It was not until 1812 that Kingston gained its first concession, a public market; and it was not until 1826 that an act was passed authorizing volunteer fire companies. By that time Richard Cartwright had been eleven years in his grave.<sup>12</sup>

The two men differed also about the site of the capital of Upper Canada. Actually, Kingston was for the moment the seat of government and Cartwright would naturally have liked it to remain so. But Simcoe was determined that the capital would be somewhere else. He said that the place was indefensible. Besides, Dorchester wanted Kingston to be

<sup>9</sup>The only authentic account of the prosecution is found in the official record of the Court of Quarter Sessions held at Kingston on April 13 and 14, 1790, the presiding judges being Richard Cartwright, Neil McLean, and Archibald McDowall. See W. S. Herrington, *History of the County of Lennox and Addington* (Toronto, 1913), 137, 161-3.

<sup>10</sup>The first Commandant's house, at the intersection of King and Queen Streets. The house (renovated) now stands in Kiwanis Park.

<sup>11</sup>"Seriously, our good Governor is a little wild in his projects . . ." (Cartwright Letter Books, Cartwright to Todd, Oct. 14, 1793). "He is a man of warm and sanguine temper, that will not let him see any obstacles to his views; he thinks every existing regulation in England would be proper here" (*ibid.*, Cartwright to Todd, Oct. 1, 1794).

<sup>12</sup>E. E. Horsey, "Kingston" (Typescript, 1937), 81. There is a copy of this work in the Douglas Library, Queen's University.



the capital and that was enough for Simcoe, who had hated the Governor ever since the latter had said some hard things about the Queen's Rangers, Simcoe's command in the Revolutionary War. Cartwright had no objection to "York *alias* Toronto";<sup>13</sup> in fact he thought it would be a good choice as it would unite the settlements "above the Bay of Kenty and below the head of Lake Ontario, and also as it lays [*sic*] at the entrance of a communication into Lake Huron by Lake La Claye."<sup>14</sup> But the idea of fixing the seat of government on the river Trancke, or Trenche, where London now stands, was "a piece of political Quixoticism—a scheme perfectly utopian, to which nature has opposed invincible obstacles; unless Mongolfier's ingenious invention could be adapted to practical purposes, and air balloons be converted into vehicles of commerce."<sup>15</sup>

Simcoe's idea of setting up an established church in Canada along Church of England lines seemed to Cartwright another piece of foolishness. There was no better churchman in Upper Canada than Cartwright and there was no one who realized more than he did the need for religion in a colony where a sparse population suffered from "the general indifference to and total neglect of gospel ordinances."<sup>16</sup> But in October, 1790, the Reverend John Stuart had reported to Bishop Inglis that "a very great majority" of the settlers in Upper Canada was made up of Anabaptists, Presbyterians, and "other Dissenters"<sup>17</sup> and to Cartwright it was obvious that to try to turn these people into Anglicans with the promise of political preferment was "as impolitic as it was unjust." Cartwright was already growing weary of the political game.<sup>18</sup>

The Governor's American immigration policy was another headache for Cartwright. Selective immigration, Cartwright believed, was the only sound policy.<sup>19</sup> In 1792 a horde of so-called "Loyalists" had come to Canada. They landed in Kingston and turned out to be the veriest riff-raff. They were drunken and improvident; but circumstances had taken care of them and very few of them were left. It had been an unfortunate experiment but not a dangerous one. What Simcoe proposed to do was really dangerous. Americans made good settlers; none better. They understood the climate and were accustomed to pioneer conditions. But

<sup>13</sup>On August 23, 1793, Simcoe ordered the name of Toronto to be changed to York in honour of the Duke of York's success against the French in Flanders.

<sup>14</sup>Cartwright Letter Books, Cartwright to Todd, Oct. 14, 1793.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*, Cartwright to Todd, Oct. 21, 1792. An intelligent anticipation of Tennyson's *Locksley Hall*:

Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails  
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales.

<sup>16</sup>"Funeral Sermon by Rev. John Strachan" in Cartwright, *Life and Letters of the Late Hon. Richard Cartwright*, 11.

<sup>17</sup>*Parish Register*, 18.

<sup>18</sup>Cartwright Letter Books, Cartwright to Todd, Oct. 14, 1793.

<sup>19</sup>"In the founding of a colony, the character of the inhabitants seems to be much more material than their numbers." Cartwright Letter Books, Cartwright to His Excellency General Hunter, Aug. 23, 1799. Lieutenant General Hunter (1746-1805) was Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada from 1799 to 1805 and commander in chief of the forces in Canada. He was a brother of the famous John Hunter, M.D. (d. 1809).



they were *Americans*, republicans with an anti-British training and tradition, and how a man like Simcoe, with his background and experience, could believe for one moment that the grant of a few acres of scrub in the Canadian northland was to turn American citizens into loyal subjects of the King was beyond the Honourable Richard Cartwright's comprehension.<sup>20</sup>

For his stand on the Judicature Bill, Cartwright was delated to the Home authorities as a disloyal person with republican leanings, but he was quick to refute the Governor's charges.<sup>21</sup> The passage which had stung Simcoe ran:

There is no maxim more incontestable in politics than that a government should be formed for a country, and not a country strained and distorted for the accommodation of a preconceived or speculative scheme of government. . . . This Bill . . . comes with its multifarious actions of debt, covenant, account, assumpsit, case, trespass, trover and detinue-distinctions without essential differences, running into endless mazes where even the sages of the profession have themselves been frequently bewildered. It comes with all its hydra of demurrers, replications, rejoinders, surrejoinders, rebutters and surrebutters, and all the monstrous offspring of metaphysical subtlety begotten upon chicane, to swallow up our simple forms and modes of process which are easy to be understood and followed by any man of plain sense and common education.<sup>22</sup>

Before Simcoe left the province he was to make full amends to Cartwright, but he had caused a great deal of unnecessary pain.

Cartwright was a capable journalist, and kept alive the *Kingston Gazette*<sup>23</sup> during the difficult years of 1812-14. Under the pseudonym "Falkland" he contributed a number of powerful articles to its columns, denouncing the military preparations of the Americans and the provocative and aggressive utterances of their President and his Secretary for War. But, like Churchill's, his words of warning fell on deaf ears and he was unable to prevent the storm from breaking.

When he saw that war was inevitable Cartwright was beset with anxieties. As Colonel of militia and Lieutenant of the county he knew the parlous state of Kingston's military defences and the humiliating plight of the provincial marine.<sup>24</sup> One hundred veterans, many of them "totally unfit for active service," constituted the garrison; of the four war vessels on Lake Ontario, one was in poor shape, another was unseaworthy, a third was fit only for seamen's quarters during the winter, and the fourth was too large for cutting-out expeditions. Of the 280 ratings on two of the ships, only thirty-four were fit for duty. The naval hospital at Point

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, Cartwright to Hunter, Aug. 23, 1799.

<sup>21</sup>*Ibid.*, Cartwright to Todd, Oct. 1, 1794.

<sup>22</sup>*Ibid.*, Speech on the Judicature Bill in the Legislative Council, Monday, June 16, 1794.

<sup>23</sup>Founded in 1810.

<sup>24</sup>E. A. Cruickshank, "The Contest for the Command of Lake Ontario in 1812 and 1813" (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd Series, X, Section II, 1916, 162).

Frederick was packed with men suffering from scurvy and from every imaginable disease sailors have had from the beginning of time. American espionage was active.<sup>25</sup> Ill health and personal bereavement saddened Cartwright at this time. Within three years he lost four of his children.<sup>26</sup> He felt keenly the death of his friends, Sir Isaac Brock and Dr. John Stuart. But as a public man Richard Cartwright had to carry on. After the famous "battle of Kingston" on November 10, 1812, when the American Commodore Chauncey attacked the town, Representative Cartwright strongly supported the Executive Council of Upper Canada in their demand for the reorganization of the provincial marine. He threw himself into essential war work, gave a patriotic talk to the militia, and helped to organize the Loyal and Patriotic Society which assisted disabled militiamen and their families and gave relief to sick and disabled civilians.

During the two years of conflict Cartwright saw Kingston grow from an insignificant little village into a naval and military centre of first importance. It was, after the sack of York, the actual if not the legal capital of Upper Canada. It had its Government House and its administrative buildings. Everyone of importance in the province was there at one time or another—Sir George Prevost, General Drummond, Lieutenant General Sir George Murray, Commodore Sir James Yeo. A brother of Sir Walter Scott was the regimental paymaster of the 70th. Cartwright met all these people and entertained them in his home.

But he grew increasingly unwell and found it more and more difficult to attend to his parliamentary duties. He worried about his business. He was anxious about his wife's future and appointed Dr. Strachan as guardian of his four children. When he told his doctor that he was going to Montreal to help wind up the estate of his friend James McGill, who had died in 1813, he was advised to try to go as far as Kamouraska and take a course of sea-bathing. But the treatment almost killed him and he went back to Montreal. There, on July 27, 1815, he died of cancer of the throat and was buried in the Protestant Burial Ground. Had he lived a few weeks longer he would have seen the keel of the S.S. *Frontenac* laid down at Finkle's Point at Bath. The *Frontenac* was the first steamboat to operate on the Great Lakes, and it was a number of Cartwright's old friends who found the capital to build her. But as Maurya says sadly in *Riders to the Sea*, "No man can be living for ever, and we must be satisfied."

Richard Cartwright was a man of high character. He made his mistakes, and if some of his actions seem high-handed and even cruel to us today, we must remember the difficult times he lived in and the circumstances he had to meet. He was an honest, modest man who repeatedly refused a seat in the Executive Council because he did not think he could find the time to study its problems. Much of his best work was done behind the scenes. He was the adviser and trusted friend of successive

<sup>25</sup>Cartwright Letter Books, Cartwright to Major McKenzie, Nov. 2, 1808.

<sup>26</sup>George W. Spragge (ed.), *The John Strachan Letter Book: 1812-1834* (Toronto, 1946), 36, 65.

lieutenant-governors and administrators of the province. There was nothing magnetic about his personality; on the contrary he rather repelled strangers. He did John Strachan, when the latter arrived from Scotland, at Cartwright's invitation, to teach school in Kingston and to lay the foundations for higher education. It was only when people got to know him that they found Richard Cartwright a warm, friendly, humorous, and witty man. He kept slaves; but so did the Reverend John Stuart and at the time people saw no harm in the practice. Cartwright was not what is commonly called "a great man" and had he lived today his achievement would no doubt have been relatively the same. He had no vision of dominion from sea to sea but the well-being of his province lay very near his heart. He was a good citizen and helped to lay well and truly the foundations of our local municipal government and our social services. There was nothing weak about him. On the contrary there must have been a strain of iron in his system. Had there not been he could never have stood up to the impetuous Simcoe as he did, nor retained his influence over the domineering Strachan. It was largely through Cartwright that John Strachan decided to take holy orders. It will always be said of Richard Cartwright that he achieved greatly in the difficult formative years of his infant province.



## SIR JOHN MACDONALD AND KINGSTON

D. G. CREIGHTON

*University of Toronto*

THERE are comparatively few men in Canadian public life who, in the popular imagination of their countrymen, remain fixed to a precise and particular spot of ground, like a building to its site or a tree to its own patch of hillside. We think—as is appropriate enough for citizens of a country of vast and often monotonously featureless areas—not so much of particular localities as of regions. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, we agree, represents Quebec; the rather solemn Sir Robert Borden stands for the gravity and high sense of responsibility of Nova Scotia; and there are times when Mr. Crerar seems to personify the earnest, slightly puzzled air of well-meaning aspiration which we associate with the West. Our geographical identifications are not often more precise. Almost any other French-Canadian village, we feel, would have done equally well for Sir Wilfrid as St. Lin. The fact that Sir Robert was born at Grand Pré is not charged, for us, with any peculiar significance; and nobody seems concerned to point out at what precise spot on the prairie frontier Mr. Crerar began to acquire his sensitive realization of the iniquities of the East. There are not many exceptions to this habit of regional or provincial identification; but there are some and they are highly significant. Joseph Howe, for all time, will remain inescapably attached to Halifax; George Brown speaks with the authentic assertive voice of mid-nineteenth-century Toronto. And Sir John Macdonald was a Kingstonian, the recognizable product of a town which, in the Canada of the nineteenth century, had its own distinctive character and its own definite role to play.

In a small memorandum book belonging to Hugh Macdonald, Sir John Macdonald's father, it is recorded that on July 17, 1820, Hugh and his wife and their four children "entered Colonel Macpherson's house at Kingston." Young John was about five and a half years old when his family, fresh from Glasgow, found a temporary refuge with their Kingston relatives. He grew up at Kingston, at Hay Bay, and at Glenora, in Prince Edward County; and long after his first partner and early friend, Sir Alexander Campbell, described him as a typical Midland District, Bay of Quinte boy, with the expressions and turns of phrase characteristic of the region. He went to the Midland District Grammar School on what is now Lower Union Street. He was articled to an able Kingston lawyer, George Mackenzie; and the tiny brick building in which he established his first professional office still stands on the east side of Wellington Street, between Brock and Princess. He was married to his first wife, Isabella Clark, in Kingston's St. Andrew's Church; and the house to which a few years later he brought the ailing Isabella, when she had returned at last from her long convalescence in the south, still looks out over Hales's cottages toward Lake Ontario. Macdonald was a member of the corporation of Kingston, although never its mayor. As an alder-

man he sat at the head table at the banquet which celebrated the completion of the town hall. Here he was elected to the provincial legislature for the first time in 1844 as member for Kingston. He sat for Kingston in the Assembly of the united province of Canada until Confederation ended its existence; and with two exceptions he continued as member for Kingston in every parliament of Canada from 1867 until his death. Kingston witnessed his electoral successes, his early professional triumphs, and many of the happy occasions and tragedies of his family life; and here he and his first wife, his eldest son, and his father and mother and sisters were buried.

It is true that in the eighteen-sixties and particularly after 1867 the old intimate association between the town and its most famous son was interrupted by longer and longer absences. After the government of Canada had ceased to wander agitatedly from Kingston to Montreal and from Quebec to Toronto, like a harassed leaseholder looking for a new furnished apartment, and after Queen Victoria had, oddly enough, selected Ottawa as the permanent seat of government, Macdonald was obliged, of course, to settle down in that outlandish capital. But he never succumbed to the delusion, so prevalent now in that city's population, since the brave days when Canada became the spoil of bureaucrats, that Ottawa has, in and for itself, a mysterious symbolic importance for the country as a whole. Ottawa was then—and for that matter is now—a rather tasteless agglomeration of buildings with an untidy fringe of lumber yards. Situated on the interprovincial boundary, remote from the centres of civilization, Ottawa had at once the characterlessness of a border post and the rusticity of a backwoods village. And almost invariably Macdonald escaped from it as soon as was possible. He had a summer house at Rivière du Loup; he regularly visited Kingston; and sometimes, when he could get away for longer periods, he went abroad, not to some banal hotel set in Florida orange groves, but to London, where he could meet fresh faces, and go to theatres, and get good conversation. In 1873, when the Pacific Scandal gave him an even longer vacation from political worries, he moved up to Toronto, where his old legal firm had been transferred some years previously, and established himself in a house on St. George St. Kingston and Toronto—they were equally good places for a civilized Ontarian to live in; but Kingston still held for him a special place. In all kinds of little unobtrusive ways, as well as in more obvious efforts to cultivate his constituency, he kept up the old association; and its enduring strength is well illustrated in that last silent journey from Ottawa down to the old capital of the Midland District in June, 1891.

The long duration and the intimacy of the connection may be at once admitted; but what did it mean for Macdonald? Did the title "Kingstonian" identify him with anything more than a spot on the map? Did Kingston, like a little Manchester, connote a system of ideas, or at least imply a definite point of view? It is absolutely essential, out of common politeness to the intelligence of this audience, to begin with ideas. Our own age, which is chiefly remarkable for its obsession with considerations of power and for its inventive genius in the manufacture of engines of



mass destruction, shows a morbid, almost psychopathic interest in ideas. The figures of Canadian history—and for that matter everybody else with the important exception of ourselves—are judged by these rationalist intellectual standards. The possession of ideas makes a Canadian statesman; the failure to do anything much about them constitutes, apparently, his chief claim to the admiration of posterity. Mr. King wrote a book; William Lyon Mackenzie drafted a republican constitution; Edward Blake had a number of brilliant ideas on such important topics as the Hare system of proportional representation. Even Sir Wilfrid Laurier, at an important moment in his political career, changed the red garments of his anti-clerical republicanism for the sober habiliments of English liberalism; and this astute realization of a need for shifting his custom to a more reputable tailor is usually regarded as a supreme example of the intense intellectual activity so characteristic of the old Liberal leader.

Judged by these exacting rationalist standards, Macdonald seems to come off rather badly. He did not write a book, or edit a newspaper, or draft a manifesto on first principles, or deliver highly intellectual speeches of five hours' duration. It is true that, as D'Arcy McGee claims, he was the principal author of the Quebec Resolutions; but the Quebec Resolutions, like so many other of Macdonald's programmes and policies, suffer from the fatal defect of having been translated into action. They did not remain theory; they became reality; and, having lost the eternal glitter of abstraction, they have suffered from the wear and tear of usage and disrespectful familiarity. As everybody knows, an idea of the past which is unnoticed or unpopular in the present is regarded, not only as a poor idea, but also as virtually no idea at all. The murderous analysis to which we subject the notions of our ancestors is suitably matched by the bland complacency with which we accept our own at their portentous face value. We may as well admit that Macdonald's intellectual stock does not get very high quotations at the present moment. The sad fact is that he is not even studied in some graduate courses in Canadian political thought. Possibly the very word ideas—so appropriate when we speak of William Lyon Mackenzie, William McDougall, Goldwin Smith, Henri Bourassa, J. S. Ewart, Henry Wise Wood and William Aberhart—is seriously out of place in a discussion of Macdonald. Loyalties, convictions, habits of mind, assumptions, even prejudices—these humbler words will perhaps serve us better. In what ways, if at all, did Kingston influence their formation in Macdonald?

It is perfectly clear that Macdonald's main political convictions were formed long before he fought his first electoral contest in 1844. He was—it seems necessary to state the fact, if only for purposes of historical definition—a Conservative. At the present moment, the word Conservative has, perhaps, an old-fashioned sound, a distant and almost historical ring; it is heard faintly and far off, like a diminishing echo. We are, in fact, back in the quaint old days when people held different views on public questions, when the ancient system of government and opposition still maintained itself in lusty vigour, and when the citizens of the English-speaking world did not troop off, in great dutiful masses, to record



their votes in favour of what are virtually the official parties of the state. Nowadays, when the whole of humanity lives blanketed in the propaganda which emanates from the two super-powers, the United States and Russia, the analysis of any single person's political views and aspirations becomes a routine task, at once perfunctory and tedious. But in those days there was space, and air, and light, in which convictions and purposes could grow up from their own soil, taking colour and form from their own landscape. And Kingston, and the Midland District, meant more than a little for Macdonald.

He grew up in a community which was certainly conservative but which, at the same time, was not entirely comfortable inside the old Tory party, nor entirely satisfied with its leadership. The members of Macdonald's family, the solicitor to whom he was articled, and most of his early friends were all Conservatives. The little associations and institutions which held together the Scottish community of Kingston—the Celtic Society, the St. Andrews Society, and St. Andrew's Church—were resolute in their stand for the British connection, and in their opposition to French and American republicanism. And Kingston, ever since it had been given a seat in the provincial assembly, had regularly, with one rather doubtful exception, returned Conservative members. The political climate of the town seemed bland, unruffled, even perhaps a little stuffy; but there were, nevertheless, little insidious winds of criticism and occasional obstreperous gusts of revolt. Kingston, which had been the real, though not the titular, capital of the old Upper Canada, the Upper Canada of the Loyalists, had never submissively accepted the rule of Toronto as the seat of government; and St. Andrew's Church, which regarded itself as part of one of the two established churches of the Empire, with rights solemnly guaranteed by the Act of Union of England and Scotland, remained obstinately unimpressed by the claims and pretensions of the Anglican Tories of the capital. Finally, St. Andrew's, and Kingston, and the Midland District as a whole were set in the eastern part of the province, in the oldest established region of Upper Canada, the citizens of which, whether they were Reformers or Conservatives, always looked with a certain cautious and superior distrust on the agitations, extravagances, and crusades of Toronto and the West.

It was in this political atmosphere that Macdonald grew to manhood. And in his political inheritance the reservations and qualifications were almost as important as the main convictions and loyalties which they modified. He looked upon his fellow party members, the Toronto Tories, with irreverent detachment. In 1846, when he was still a very young parliamentarian, but old enough to know better, he spoke so disrespectfully one evening of the Boulton family, one of the main props of the Toronto compact, that young William Henry Boulton, a Conservative member for Toronto, challenged him to a duel. Everybody at the time regarded Macdonald as the protégé of William Henry Draper, the first of the liberal conservative leaders, whom the Toronto members hated and against whom they fought and intrigued for years; and when in 1847, at the youthful age of thirty-two, he joined the Conservative ministry as

Receiver-General, he did so partly, no doubt, in response to William Morris's plea for aid in the struggle inside the party against the Family Compact. For seven years more the conflict between the Toryism of the past and the Liberal-Conservatism of the future went on within the agitated and divided ranks of the party; and it was not until 1854 that Macdonald, constantly supported by the moderates, got at length the place which he deserved and the political alliances he had struggled so long to obtain.

In him, the eastern section of the province triumphed. Through him it wrenched the leadership away from Toronto and repudiated Toronto's extreme conservatism. It was an interesting achievement; and all the more interesting when we remember that the eastern Conservatives succeeded where the eastern Reformers dismally failed. The Toronto Tories, Boulton, and Sherwood, and Cameron, were put in their place; but George Brown and the Toronto Grits continued, on the whole, to dominate the Reform party. The success of John Alexander Macdonald of Kingston was clinched, for the Conservatives, by the relative failure of John Sandfield Macdonald of Cornwall. Kingston, perhaps alone of all the towns in the eastern part of the province, was sufficiently strong to lead its section to a real victory. And that victory meant the rejuvenation of the party. In 1847, in the general election which quickly followed Macdonald's first acceptance of office, Conservatism went down in a defeat which looked almost like annihilation. But by 1854, under Macdonald's leadership, it had achieved a remarkable recovery; and with few and brief intervals thereafter, it continued to dominate Canadian politics for another forty years. Macdonald, in fact, repeated after 1867 exactly the same kind of success which he had scored before Confederation. In the old province of Canada, he had made a truly provincial party, while the Reformers remained divided in sectional fragments. In the Dominion of Canada—if it is still permissible to use Macdonald's old term "dominion" despite the recent veto of the bureaucrats in the Department of External Affairs—he built a national party, while the Liberals, for a long time, still stuck to their old provincial loyalties.

The fact is, Macdonald was a nationalist; and this is, of course, one of his major defects in the eyes of the modern world. Nationalism in the nineteen-fifties is to a considerable extent an unpopular and slightly suspect creed. The enormous prestige which it enjoyed in the nineteenth century has been steadily eaten away by two forces of great potency—by internationalism on the one hand and provincialism and localism on the other. These two forces are apparently contradictory; but in their destructive effects on nationalism, they complement each other. And, in fact, it is easy for them to go together. People with limited knowledge and experience are notoriously susceptible to grandiose ideas. Mere bigness is the one thing which will intimidate them into respectful silence. Shrewd in small matters, they are easy marks for gigantic frauds. And there has been something specious, not to say spurious, in the fashionable internationalism of the last few years. The grand design of a world brotherhood of states has ended in harsh reality; and inside the surviving



shell of the United Nations the two great powers, the United States and Russia, try to appropriate the myth upon which the organization was founded, and struggle to extend and protect their own particular version of it. The whole world follows them, willingly or unwillingly; and in effect they now lead two great aggregations of satellite states. The old multiple divisions have been replaced by a single division; the old flexibility has given way to an intense rigidity; and all the small varied contradictions of the past have degenerated into a single and fatal anti-thesis.

The only force capable of opposing this bogus internationalism—this movement towards unification not for world peace but for world rivalry—was the old national state. But the national state was in no position to sustain this resistance. It had been ground down and weakened by a nether as well as by an upper millstone—by the disintegrating pressure of parochialism and provincialism as well as by the external weight of the internationalist idea. The obvious decay of national parliamentary life in Canada, the decline of old parties and the patent failure of new parties to take their place, the apathetic and uninterested acceptance by the populace of increasingly ponderous and mechanical forms of government, are all evidence of the submissive inertia of our national political existence. The strength of any real opposition resides mainly in the provinces and municipalities; vitality and creativeness are to be found chiefly in the cultural and political movements of regions. And in Europe and the East the process has gone even further. The organic political unities of the past—states, empires, and commonwealths—have disintegrated under the divisive force of these parochial agitations. The old national state has been fragmented, shredded away into nothing; and people, freed from their old loyalties, separated from the strong, viable unities of history, become like heaps of dust or sand, blown listlessly about by the great winds of power.

It is only, therefore, by an effort of the imagination that we can get back to Macdonald. Macdonald represented Kingston; and Kingston stood at the head of the St. Lawrence River, at the foot of the vast inter-connecting system of the Great Lakes. To Kingston and Kingston's sons the river was the prime symbol of British North American unity and British North American growth; and the main task of Macdonald's entire career was to defend and enlarge the political union which the St. Lawrence required and to realize the possibilities which it seemed to promise. At first, during the early history of the united province of Canada, his role was largely a negative one. The western section of Canada West—Canada West beyond Toronto—was always full of impatient schemes for the break-up of the legislative union, for the alteration of the fundamental compromises upon which it was based, or for the substitution of some weak form of federal union loosely uniting the two sections of the province. But the great central part of old Canada—the stretch of territory which lay in general between Toronto and Montreal—instinctively and stubbornly opposed all these disintegrating schemes. Kingston, the unofficial capital of the upper St. Lawrence, was intent upon the survival of the river's unity; and for nearly fifteen years



Macdonald opposed the fatal division of the province with all the resources and infinite devices at his command. The only solution for the difficulties of the Canadian union which he ever accepted was the wider union of British North America. From the first he wished it to be a strong union—a legislative union; and, as everybody knows, he accepted the federal form regretfully as the only way in which his desire could be accomplished.

It is this, in part, which has led to his comparative neglect and disparagement in recent times. The liveliness of provincial politics and of regional cultural movements, as well as the gaudy attractions of the international arena as it is managed by the two big-time operators, have sufficed to turn attention away from Macdonald and the other nationalists of the past. The effects are clearly visible in Canadian history and the Canadian social sciences. Soon everybody in the country will be writing either about international affairs or about provincial protest movements. One group of scholars will be eagerly ploughing through the vast masses of literature in which the Department of External Affairs annually celebrates its activities abroad, in pursuit of that mysterious something usually referred to as the role of Canada in world affairs; and another group of scholars, equally zealous and filled with equal admiration and respect for their subject, will be analysing all the local agitations, and protests, and grievances in our history. Two decades ago there was apparently a scheme proposed for a co-operative history of Canada in several volumes. The volumes, of course, have not made their appearance; there is now little likelihood that they will. But, on the other hand, a series of no fewer than ten or twelve studies on Social Credit in Alberta is being vigorously prosecuted; and the first two admirable volumes in the series have already been published. The theme of national unity and its symbol, the St. Lawrence, are not only neglected; they have been politely, but vigorously questioned and historians who have, so to speak, taken their stand on the east-west axis have been lumped together, not altogether sympathetically, as the "Laurentian School." A few years ago a distinguished Western historian declared that the West "must realize its latent nationalism" and that it might with French Canada "end the Laurentian domination." "The west," he observed, "must first work out its own historical experience—and free itself and find itself."

One does not need to be a major prophet to predict with reasonable accuracy where the West would "find itself" if it "freed itself" from what has been called the "Laurentian domination." And this brings up the question of foreign policy, the last aspect of Macdonald's Kingston inheritance upon which I should like to touch. It sometimes seems to be assumed by the able army of bureaucrats who at present direct our external relations that up until the fortunate moment of their own arrival at the East Block in Ottawa, Canada had, in fact, no foreign policy at all. This assumption is perhaps not altogether unnatural since our modern corps of diplomatists was mainly recruited after the virtual abandonment of the only great historic foreign policy which Canada has ever had. That policy was the creation of Macdonald; and its prime object was the secure establishment of a new nationality, autonomous within the British

Empire and separate and distinct on the North American continent. Canada, Macdonald reasoned, was—and for a long time would remain—too weak to stand alone; and the basic condition of its survival and growth toward self-sufficiency was a relative balance of power within the English-speaking world. Of the two imperialisms, American and British, with which we had to deal, the former was by far the more dangerous. After 1783 the United States was the only expansive force on the North American continent. There was always the acute embarrassment of its proximity; and, after the Civil War, the further danger of its conscious power. To meet that danger, to maintain the balance of power by which alone it could be met with success, the British connection was necessary, for the British connection was, in essence, simply an Anglo-Canadian *entente*. By the Anglo-Canadian *entente*, Macdonald hoped to escape the peril of North American continentalism until, at last, Canada might stand alone.

The convictions upon which this policy was based were strengthened and confirmed as Macdonald grew up in the Kingston period. Kingston, as I have suggested, was the real though not the official capital of the old province of Upper Canada, the province of the Loyalists. The Loyalist tradition is the historic source of resistance to North American continentalism; and Kingston, in a special and concrete sense, was the physical embodiment of that resistance, in the upper St. Lawrence valley. As the Canadian naval base on Lake Ontario, as the western terminus of the life-line of the St. Lawrence, Kingston's security was essential to the survival of Upper Canada; and the fortifications which were built to protect it, the largest fortifications ever constructed in the upper province, testify still to the strategic importance which was once attached to the place. For nearly a century, from 1783 to 1871, Kingston stood warily upon the defensive. The War of 1812 was not the only danger; and the peace of Ghent, which is popularly supposed to have inaugurated the period of the "unguarded frontier," was actually the prelude to a series of threats, and to the greatest programme of defence construction in the history of Upper Canada. In the western part of the province, the Rebellion of 1837 at least *began* as a native uprising; but for Kingston in the upper St. Lawrence valley, it began, continued, and ended as a series of American raids.

During the past quarter-century, Macdonald's policy has disappeared with the passing of the moral and material bases upon which it was founded. The decline of Great Britain ended the old balance of power in the English-speaking world just as it did on the continent of Europe. Lord Halifax's vain appeal in Toronto in January, 1944 was probably invalidated by the facts. But it was also instantly repudiated in Canada; and the very automatic rapidity of that repudiation suggests how completely the intellectual as well as the physical bases of the old policy had been eaten away. That pious labour of destruction was the work of the Canadian nationalists of the nineteen-twenties and thirties. For two decades they presented themselves proudly to enraptured Canadian audiences as the real defenders of Canadian nationalism. Publicly they abominated imperialism. Publicly, with eyes lifted to heaven, they aspired



to autonomy. These declarations were extremely solemn; they were, no doubt, in many cases, completely sincere. But, whether they deceived themselves or not, the nationalists certainly misled a considerable section of the Canadian people. For in their nationalist crusade there was a large element of North Americanism. North America is not a nation but a continent; and the continentalism which was latent in all of them was open and blatantly avowed in some, just as it was in their spiritual father, Goldwin Smith. What they disliked was the wrong type of imperialism—that is, British imperialism; but for the right type of imperialism—that is, American imperialism—they seem to have had nothing but the highest approval. And when, in the summer of 1940, at the first sign of real danger to Great Britain, Canada instantly and openly reversed this historic policy of the Anglo-Canadian *entente* the nationalists greeted the Ogdensburg agreement with either quiet satisfaction or rapturous delight. To the eyes of a historian, the Ogdensburg agreement, with its subsequent extensions and confirmations, looks like an old-fashioned military alliance, so old-fashioned, indeed, that its like has never been seen on the North American continent before. Without definite time limits, and without any very precise conditions, provisoes, or declared purposes, it appears to rest on the assumption that mere geographic proximity means absolute and eternal identity of interest.

In the military realm continentalism could hardly have gone further. Even Goldwin Smith could scarcely have wished for more. The nationalists became silent, with the silence of satisfied men. The discussions of Canadian foreign policy, so agitated during the nineteen-thirties, died away. The references to Canadian autonomy have grown increasingly discreet. "Imperialism," and "neutrality," the key words of the nineteen-thirties, are now virtually taboo. Like so many Colonel Blimps, the nationalists of yesteryear rest comfortably in the deep arm-chairs of the Continental Club; and if occasionally, with offended pomposity, they write to the papers it is only to denounce some misguided Canadian who has dared to criticize the Truman doctrine, or the Monroe doctrine, or the Hickenlooper doctrine, or some one of those policies with theological titles by which Americans like to indicate the intimacy of their partnership with God.

In June, 1951 it will be sixty years since Macdonald died. His portrait on the wall of the Memorial Hall in the Kingston Municipal Buildings makes him look astonishingly alive, but in many ways nobody could be more dead and forgotten than he. Whether it is possible or desirable that there should be a reincarnation of his spirit or a revival of his policies is a difficult question which I shall leave to the joint wisdom of these two societies to determine. All I have tried to do is to recall him to your attention. Nowadays it is fashionable to talk about curtains, iron curtains and gold curtains; and it sometimes seems as if there is a curtain, thick and impenetrable, which separates us from our Canadian past. I have attempted to lift that curtain for a moment, in order to give you a glimpse of Macdonald, and of the Kingston in which his views and hopes were shaped. But, like a sensible showman, I realize that the play is now played out; and, pending a revival, I ring down the curtain once again.

## NATIONAL HISTORIC PARKS AND SITES, 1949-1950

BY THE NATIONAL PARKS AND HISTORIC SITES SERVICE, DEVELOPMENT SERVICES BRANCH, DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT

THE restoration, preservation, and administration of national historic parks and sites and the commemoration of the public services of outstanding characters in Canadian history is carried out by the National Parks and Historic Sites Service. In this phase of its work the Service is advised by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, an honorary body of recognized historians representing the various provinces of the Dominion.

Dr. J. C. Webster of Shediac, New Brunswick, who had been a member of the Board for twenty-seven years and who was appointed Chairman in November, 1943, died on March 16, 1950.

The personnel of the Board is as follows: Professor Fred Landon, London, Ontario; Professor D. C. Harvey, Halifax, Nova Scotia; the Honourable E. Fabre-Surveyer, Montreal, Quebec; J. A. Gregory, North Battleford, Saskatchewan; the Reverend Antoine d'Eschambault, Gen-thon, Manitoba; Professor M. H. Long, Edmonton, Alberta; Professor Walter N. Sage, Vancouver, British Columbia; the Honourable Thane A. Campbell, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island; Dr. Wm. Kaye Lamb, Dominion Archivist, Ottawa, Ontario; C. E. A. Jeffrey, St. John's, Newfoundland; and W. D. Cromarty, National Parks and Historic Sites Service, Ottawa, Ontario.

The annual meeting of the Board was held in Ottawa, May 30, 31, and June 1, 1949, when a wide variety of matters relating to the historic background of Canada were reviewed. Of the many sites that have been considered by the Board to date, 390 have been marked or acquired and 194 others recommended for attention at a later date.

### NATIONAL HISTORIC PARKS

*Fort Anne National Historic Park* is situated in Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia. The museum building, restored in 1935, was originally the Officers' Quarters and was built in 1797-8 under the supervision of Edward, Duke of Kent, the father of Queen Victoria, when he was commander-in-chief of the British Forces in North America with headquarters at Halifax, Nova Scotia.

The exterior of the museum building and some of the interior wood-work were painted as well as the chain fences, cannon, cannon balls, and wooden signs. Improvement work was carried out on the driveway, paths and moat. The hedges were trimmed and all bronze tablets on the park grounds cleaned.

A total of 16,283 persons signed the museum register during the year.

*Port Royal National Historic Park* is situated at Lower Granville, Nova Scotia. A replica of the group of buildings, which sheltered the first European settlers in Canada, has been erected on the exact site where the Port Royal Habitation stood nearly three and a half centuries ago. The



original Habitation was the headquarters for about two years of Samuel de Champlain, famous explorer and chief geographer to Henry IV of France. Champlain chose the location and drew up the plan of settlement.

A section of the palisades was rebuilt, repairs were made to the roof of the Habitation, and additional gravel was spread in the magazine. The buildings and grounds were carefully maintained, some of the interior woodwork was painted, and all iron work cleaned and oiled. The Scots Fort area was cleared of stones and brush and the roadway leading to it levelled and graded. The site of the John Robblee house was also filled in and levelled.

Visitors registered at the park during the year numbered 10,523.

*Fortress of Louisbourg National Historic Park* is situated about three miles from the town of Louisburg, Cape Breton Island, Nova Scotia. Here were enacted the early stages of the long struggle which culminated in the transfer of Canada to the British Crown. Erected more than two centuries ago by the French, who had named the settlement in honour of Louis XIV, King of France, Louisbourg was captured by the British forces in 1745, but was subsequently handed back to the French. The fortress was again besieged by the English and finally captured by them in 1758. It is interesting to recall that one of the brigades of infantry engaged in the recapture of Louisbourg was commanded by General Wolfe.

Considerable repair work was carried out on the walls of the museum building in an effort to prevent leakage by the driving rains, and repairs and repointing were made to the old casemates and to the remains of the Hospital and de Mezy buildings. The museum and custodian's residence were painted, the condition of the entrance road was improved, the flag pole and pump house were painted, and repairs made to the sewage system; the fence enclosing the park was repaired, the bases of the monuments were painted, and new field signs erected.

A total of 8,236 persons signed the visitors' book.

*Fort Beauséjour National Historic Park* is situated near Sackville, New Brunswick. Built by the French, the fort was intended to be an Acadian stronghold against the undefined claims of the English to Acadia. Around the fort the Acadians had their homes and farms. It was captured by the British under Monckton in 1755, when the fort was strengthened and its defences extended by a system of entrenchments, traces of which still remain.

A hand-drawn ice boat used prior to the establishment of the ferry service between Cape Tormentine, N.B., and Port Borden, P.E.I., was donated to the park by the Canadian National Railways. A section of the park area near the museum was levelled and seeded, new road signs were erected, and the trees and brush removed from along the old trench lines. The John Clarence Webster Wing of the museum was officially opened on August 2, 1949, by the Honourable Colin Gibson, then Minister of the Department of Resources and Development.

It is estimated that close to 50,000 persons visited the park during the year.

*Fort Chambly National Historic Park* is situated about twenty miles south-east of Montreal, on a conspicuous headland on the Richelieu River. The first fort, built by the French in 1665 as a protection against the Iroquois, was of wooden construction. After many vicissitudes, it was rebuilt of stone, this work being completed in 1711. In 1760 the fort was surrendered to the British, who, with a small armed force, held it until 1775. In that year the Americans captured the fort, which they evacuated in the following year. The fort was later repaired and garrisoned by Sir Guy Carleton and played an important part in the War of 1812.

The interior of the museum was completely redecorated, all display cases were stained and varnished, and the main entrance door to the fort was painted. A protection wall was constructed along the river front of the park property to prevent further erosion and repairs were made to the walls of the fort. Repairs were also made to the custodian's residence, a sump pump was installed, a new base made for one of the grave-stones in the cemetery, and top dressing spread on the lawns.

During the year 43,488 persons signed the museum register.

*Fort Lennox National Historic Park* is located on Ile-aux-Noix in the Richelieu River, about thirteen miles south of St. Johns, Quebec. The present fort, which stands on the site of one previously erected by the French, was built by the Imperial authorities in the period from 1812 to 1827. The island, comprising an area of 150 acres, was acquired by the National Parks Service in 1921, and extensive works have since been carried out on the buildings and grounds.

Permission was granted to the Jeunesse Etudiante Catholique organization to use a portion of the park property during the summer as a youth training centre. Repairs were made to the Men's Barracks and Officers' Quarters and the roofs of the Guard House, Officers' Quarters, and boat house were painted. A temporary wharf was constructed on the west side of the island for the convenience of visitors, the ramparts around the fort were cleared of dead timber, the casemate doors and picnic tables painted, all bronze tablets cleaned, and the grounds and cemetery properly maintained.

Visitors registered at the park during the year numbered 5,604.

*Fort Wellington National Historic Park* is situated at the east end of the town of Prescott, Ontario, and adjacent to Highway No. 2. The fort, named after the Duke of Wellington, was erected when the British authorities decided to fortify Prescott as one of the most vulnerable points of attack in the War of 1812, and as the main base for the defence of communications between Kingston and Montreal. It remains as it was when finally completed in 1838, an impressive landmark.

The highway fronting the fort property was reconstructed, the expense in connection with this work being shared equally by the province, the municipality, and the National Parks and Historic Sites Service; the telephone poles along the front of the park property were removed, the cable



being placed underground. The fort buildings were painted, repairs made to the Guard House, and additional lighting fixtures installed in the new museum; renovation work was carried out in the custodian's quarters and the grounds were properly maintained.

A total of 6,650 persons signed the museum register during the year.

*Fort Malden National Historic Park* is situated in Amherstburg, Ontario. The fort was built in 1797-9 by the Second Battalion, Royal Canadian Volunteers. It was strengthened in 1812 as the principal military station on the western frontier and dismantled and abandoned in September, 1813. Only slight evidences of the original fortifications remain.

A layer of crushed stone was spread on the driveway and paths, and repairs were made to the eaves troughs on the Old Mess Hall and to the drain pipes on the "Old Fort" building. New museum cases were obtained to display the exhibits which are continually being received, concrete bases were constructed on the park grounds for a water fountain, anchor, and naval gun, the posts and rails along the steps of the moat were painted, and the dead trees removed.

During the year 11,835 persons signed the museum register.

*Fort Prince of Wales National Historic Park* is situated at the mouth of Churchill River, Churchill, Manitoba, and comprises an area of approximately fifty acres. The fort was built from plans drawn by English military engineers, to secure control of Hudson Bay for the Hudson's Bay Company and England. Construction was commenced in 1733 and completed in 1771. It was surrendered to, and partially destroyed by, a French naval force under La Perouse in 1782. Its ruins, which are among the most interesting military remains on this continent, have been partly restored. Over forty cannon have been unearthed and those suitable for the purpose have been mounted on the walls of the fort.

General supervision was carried out.

#### NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES

*Sir Louis Henry Davies, K.C.M.G. and Sir Joseph Pope, K.C.M.G., C.V.O., Charlottetown, P.E.I.* Tablets were placed in the Confederation Building to Sir Louis Henry Davies, Premier, Prince Edward Island and Chief Justice of Canada, and to Sir Joseph Pope, Private Secretary to Sir John A. Macdonald, 1882-91 and Under-Secretary of State for Canada, 1896-1926. The tablets were unveiled on August 25, 1949.

*Robert Harris, C.M.G., Charlottetown, P.E.I.* A tablet was placed in the Harris Art Gallery building to Robert Harris, painter of the historic picture "The Fathers of Confederation." He was a charter member of the Royal Canadian Academy and its President, 1893-1906. The tablet was unveiled on August 25, 1949.

*Isgonish-French River Portage, near Truro, N.S.* A cut-stone monument with tablet was erected adjacent to Highway No. 2 west of Truro to mark the Isgonish-French River Portage, the chief route of the French and Indians from Cobequid to Isle St. Jean and Louisbourg and later of the British from Halifax to Charlottetown.

*Captain Savalette, Tor Bay, N.S.* A tablet was placed on a large boulder at the side of the road at Tor Bay, to Captain Savalette, pioneer of "dry" fishery in Nova Scotia. Among the islands in the bay there he carried on the "sedentary" fisheries for forty-two years prior to 1607, when he entertained both Champlain and Lescarbot on their way from Port Royal to Canso. The tablet was unveiled on July 30, 1949.

*Sir George Augustus Westphal, Sir Provo William Parry Wallis, K.C.B., G.C.B., Sir Edward Belcher, K.C.B., Philip Westphal, and George Edward Watts, C.B., Halifax, N.S.* Tablets were erected in the Maritime Museum building, HMC Dockyard, to these distinguished persons, all of whom were born around Halifax Harbour and rose to the rank of admiral in the Royal Navy. The tablets were unveiled on August 8, 1949, in the presence of officers of the Royal Navy, the United States Navy, and the Royal Canadian Navy.

*Sir John Sparrow David Thompson, P.C., K.C.M.G., Halifax, N.S.* A tablet was placed on the North End Postal Station to Sir John Sparrow David Thompson, Attorney-General of Nova Scotia, 1878-82; Premier, May to July, 1882; Justice of the Supreme Court, 1882-5; Minister of Justice of Canada, 1885-94, and Prime Minister, 1892-4.

*Harriette Taber Richardson, Port Royal National Historic Park, Lower Granville, N.S.* A tablet was erected in the Habitation in honour of Harriette Taber Richardson who first dreamed of the restoration of this building as an "Act of International Good Will." The tablet was unveiled on August 30, 1949, under the auspices of the Annapolis Royal Historical Association.

*Sir John George Bourinot, K.C.M.G., Sydney, N.S.* A table twas placed on the Post Office building to Sir John George Bourinot, historian and authority on parliamentary procedure. He was Clerk of the House of Commons, 1880-1902, and President of the Royal Society of Canada, 1892-3.

*Sir George Parkin, K.C.M.G., and Sir George Eulas Foster, G.C.M.G., Saint John, N.B.* Tablets were erected in the main hall of the New Brunswick Museum to Sir George Parkin, educationist and author, and to Sir George Eulas Foster, statesman, orator, and administrator.

*Lemuel Allan Wilmot, Fredericton, N.B.* A tablet was erected in the Legislative Assembly building to Lemuel Allan Wilmot, statesman and jurist. He was an advocate of responsible government and Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, 1868-73.

*Sir Charles Edward Saunders, London, Ontario.* A tablet was erected in the City Hall to Sir Charles Edward Saunders, distinguished experimental agriculturist. His development of Marquis wheat added untold wealth to his native land. The tablet was dedicated on April 11, 1950, under the auspices of the London and Middlesex Historical Society.

*Adam Shortt, C.M.G., London, Ontario.* A tablet was erected in the Court House building to Adam Shortt, economist, educator, and historian. He was Professor of Political Science in Queen's University, 1891-1908; Civil Service Commissioner, 1908-18, and co-editor of *Canada and Its*



*Provinces.* The tablet was dedicated on April 11, 1950, under the auspices of the London and Middlesex Historical Society.

*Sir John Stephen Willison, K.B., Goderich, Ontario.* A tablet was placed on the Court House building to Sir John Stephen Willison, journalist, author, and publicist. He was editor of the *Globe*, 1890-1902, and of the *News*, Toronto, 1902-10. The tablet was unveiled on November 16, 1949, under the sponsorship of the County Council of Huron.

*Sir William Buell Richards, K.B., Brockville, Ontario.* A tablet was placed on the Court House building to Sir William Buell Richards, jurist and legislator. He was Attorney-General for Canada West, 1851-3, and first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, 1875-9. The tablet was unveiled on September 2, 1949.

*Sir Richard William Scott, K.B., Prescott, Ontario.* A tablet was placed in the Town Hall to Sir Richard William Scott, Secretary of State for Canada, 1874-8 and 1896-1908. He was father of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878 ("The Scott Act"). The tablet was unveiled on September 3, 1949, during the centennial celebration at Prescott.

*La Vérendrye's Journey to the Mandans near Morden, Manitoba.* A boulder with tablet was erected adjacent to Highway No. 3, about ten miles west of Morden, to commemorate La Vérendrye's journey through that region. With two of his sons he had left Fort La Reine on October 18, 1738, on his way to the country of the Mandans whence, by following the Missouri, he hoped to reach the western sea. The monument was unveiled on Labour Day, September 5, 1949, under the auspices of the Pembina Hills Historical Society.

*First Legislature of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba.* A tablet was placed on the National Canadian Bank Building, Main Street, to commemorate the first legislature of Manitoba, which met in the home nearby of the Honourable A. G. B. Bannatyne, on March 15, 1871.

*Preservation of the Plains Buffalo, Elk Island National Park, Alberta.* A cut-stone monument with tablet was erected on the beach lawn to commemorate the preservation of the Plains Buffalo. Ruthlessly slaughtered for meat and hides, this noble animal almost became extinct, but in 1906 the Dominion Government procured in Montana the last large herd. Their offspring now graze by thousands in various national parks of western Canada. The monument was unveiled on Labour Day, September 5, 1949, under the auspices of the Historical Society of Alberta and the Northern Alberta Pioneers and Old Timers' Society.

*Okanagan Brigade Trail, Westbank, B.C.* A cairn with tablet was erected adjacent to the highway at the eastern outskirts of Westbank to mark the Okanagan Brigade Trail, a link in the fur-trading route from New Caledonia (North Central British Columbia) to the Columbia River. First explored by the Astorians in 1811, the trail was used by the North West Company and from 1821 by the Hudson's Bay Company. The fur brigades from New Caledonia journeyed by this route from Kamloops to "Fort Okanagan" until 1848. The monument was unveiled on August 24, 1949, under the auspices of the Okanagan Historical Society and the Westbank Women's Institute.

## REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

### CANADIAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING

THE annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association was held at the Royal Military College, Kingston, Ontario, June 8-10. The facilities provided by the College were excellent in all respects and contributed greatly to the success of the meeting. The attendance at the conference, which surpassed all expectations, was a real tribute to the work and planning of the programme committee.

The conference opened Wednesday evening, June 7, with a meeting of the Local History Committee under the chairmanship of G. W. Spragge and a meeting of the editors and the advisory board of the *Canadian Historical Review*. The general session, held the following morning, June 8, took for its theme the influence of revolutionary and republican France on French Canada and the following papers were read: "Lamartine et la jeunesse republicaine du Canada français en 1848" by Séraphin Marion, and "Quebec and the French Revolution of 1789" by Mason Wade. At noon, members of the Association were guests of the Kingston Historical Society at a luncheon in Fort Henry. Luncheon was followed by a general session held in the Fort at which Antoine Roy read a paper on "Le Fort Frontenac ou Catarakoui sous le régime français," and Ronald Way gave a paper on "Historical Restorations." After the general session the Fort Henry Guard gave an interesting demonstration of foot and arms drill and gun drill as it was performed a century ago. Thursday evening a dinner was given for members of both the Association and the Canadian Political Science Association by the Royal Military College. Following dinner, Brigadier D. R. Agnew, Commandant of the Royal Military College, presided at the joint session with the Canadian Political Science Association. A. L. Burt gave his presidential address entitled "Wide Horizons," and K. W. Taylor read a paper on "Some Aspects of Population Theory." At the general session Friday morning, June 9, three widely varied aspects of the military theme were presented when the following papers were read: "The Queen's Rangers and Their Contribution in the Years 1776 to 1784," by Harold M. Jackson, "Habits gris et chemise rouge," by Léopold Lamontagne, and "Sir Sam Hughes and the Problem of Imperialism," by Sam H. S. Hughes. Friday afternoon was devoted to an enjoyable harbour trip aboard H.M.C.S. *Portage*, followed by tea at the Officers' Mess, National Defence College, Fort Frontenac. His Worship, the Mayor, and the City of Kingston gave a dinner for members of the Association and the Canadian Political Science Association Friday evening which was followed by papers by James Roy on "The Honourable Richard Cartwright," and Donald G. Creighton on "Sir John Macdonald and Kingston." Saturday morning, June 10, the conference was brought to a close with a general meeting of the Association.

The following officers were elected for the season 1950-1: President, G. E. Wilson; Vice-President, A. G. Dorland; English Secretary and Treasurer, David Farr (on leave of absence); Acting English Secretary



and Treasurer, William Ormsby; French Secretary, Séraphin Marion. The following four members were elected to the Council of the Association to take the place of those whose terms had expired: W. E. Ireland, W. S. MacNutt, A. Roy, R. M. Saunders.

At the general session held on Saturday, June 8, the Association passed a hearty vote of thanks to the individuals who contributed to the success of the meeting. The Honourable Brooke Claxton, Minister of National Defence and President of the Royal Military College, was thanked for procuring a financial grant which enabled the Association to provide assistance for its members desiring to attend the annual meeting in Kingston and for placing the facilities of the Royal Military College at the disposal of the Association. Brigadier D. R. Agnew, Commandant, Royal Military College, Colonel W. R. Sawyer, Vice Commandant, Royal Military College, and their staff were thanked for the fine hospitality shown to the Association and for their co-operation in making local arrangements. Dr. G. F. G. Stanley and Dr. R. A. Preston were thanked for the splendid programme arranged. Mr. Ronald Way, Curator of Fort Henry, Captain Laycock, and members of the Fort Henry Guard were remembered for the privilege of visiting Fort Henry for luncheon and for the display of foot and arms drill. Colonel C. M. Strange and the members of the Kingston Historical Society were thanked for the luncheon tendered members of the Association in Fort Henry. Lieutenant General Guy Simonds, Commandant of Fort Frontenac, was thanked for the tea given members of the Association and for the privilege of visiting Fort Frontenac. Vice Admiral Grant, Chief of Naval Staff and Lieutenant E. P. Earnshaw, Commanding Officer of H.M.C.S. *Portage* and his crew were thanked for the extremely enjoyable harbour cruise. Dr. Clifford Curtis, Mayor of the City of Kingston, and the Corporation of the City of Kingston were thanked for the dinner tendered members of the Association.

The question of publishing an index to the Association's *Annual Reports* was discussed in the business meetings of the Council and a committee consisting of Dr. Stanley, Dr. Wilson, and Colonel Stacey was set up to investigate the possibilities with regard to financing this publication.

The resignation of Dr. Séraphin Marion, as French Secretary, was reluctantly accepted at the fall meeting of the Council and a resolution expressing the Council's deep appreciation for Dr. Marion's fifteen years of service and his great contribution to the Association was unanimously adopted. Antoine Roy, the Archivist of Quebec, was co-opted to serve as French Secretary for the year 1950-1.

W. G. ORMSBY

## REPORT OF THE TREASURER

### STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED APRIL 30, 1950

#### RECEIPTS

Balance on hand May 1st, 1949 .....			\$1,670.24
Refund from Canadian Passenger Association .....		4.00	
Bank Interest .....		6.74	
Premium on U.S. Funds .....		14.15	
Membership Fees .....	1,729.63		
Less amount collected for joint membership and remitted to Canadian Political Science Asso- ciation .....	285.00	1,444.63	
Sale of <i>Reports</i> .....		228.10	1,697.62
			\$3,367.86

#### DISBURSEMENTS

Canadian Passenger Association .....		3.25	
Audit Fee, Cunningham & Co. ....		10.00	
Exchange .....	21.28		
Less exchange added to cheques received .....	16.66	4.62	
University of Toronto Press:			
Printing <i>Report</i> .....	766.44		
<i>Canadian Historical Review</i> .....	903.35	1,669.79	
<i>Bulletin des Recherches Historiques</i> .....		89.00	
Administration:			
Clerical Assistance .....	80.00		
Leclerc Printers .....	48.06		
Petty Cash, including Postage .....	40.00	168.06	
Grants for travelling expenses of members to Annual General Meeting in Halifax .....		668.00	
Refund to Reserve Account of amount advanced for printing <i>Annual Report</i> .....		500.00	
			3,112.72
Balance on hand and in Bank .....			255.14
			\$3,367.86



## RESERVE ACCOUNT

Balance May 1st, 1949:

In Bank .....	599.32	
Dominion of Canada Bonds .....	1,000.00	1,599.32

*Receipts:*

Bank Interest .....	10.74	
Bond Interest .....	38.37	49.11

Life Membership Fees .....	100.00	
----------------------------	--------	--

Exchange added to cheques received .....	.33	
--	-----	--

Less exchange charged by Bank .....	.20	.13
-------------------------------------	-----	-----

	149.24	
--	--------	--

Transferred from Reserve Account

Refund of amount advanced for printing

Annual Report .....	500.00	649.24
---------------------	--------	--------

		\$2,248.56
--	--	------------

Balance April 30th, 1950:

On deposit in the Bank of Montreal .....	740.44	
--	--------	--

Dominion of Canada Bonds:

Due 1963, 3%—at cost .....	500.00	
----------------------------	--------	--

“ 1966, 3%—at cost .....	1,008.12	1,508.12	\$2,248.56
--------------------------	----------	----------	------------

Examined with the books and vouchers  
and found correct.

CUNNINGHAM & Co.,  
Auditors

W. G. ORMSBY  
Acting English Secretary and Treasurer

Ottawa, May 25th, 1950

## MEMBERSHIP OF THE CANADIAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

### (A) AFFILIATED SOCIETIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

- Acadia University Library*, Wolfville, N.S., Mrs. Mary K. Ingraham, Librarian.
- American Antiquarian Society*. Clifford K. Shipton, Librarian, Worcester, Mass.
- Antiquarian and Numismatic Society of Montreal*, Chateau de Ramezay, 290 Notre-Dame St. E., Montreal. Victor Morin, LL.D., President, 57 rue Saint-Jacques ouest, Montréal; Pemberton Smith, Treasurer, 414 St. James St. W., Montreal.
- British Museum*, Dept. of Printed Books, London, W.C. 1, England.
- Carleton College Library*, 268 First Ave., Ottawa.
- Chicoutimi, Séminaire de*, Chicoutimi, P.Q.
- Clark University Library*, Worcester, Mass., U.S.A. Louis N. Wilson, Librarian.
- Cleveland Public Library*, 325 Superior Ave. N.E., Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.A. Miss Leta E. Adams, Order Librarian.
- Columbia University Library*, New York, N.Y., U.S.A. D. B. Hepburn, Supervisor, Acquisition Department.
- La Société Historique de la Cote Nord*, Président, Mgr René Bélanger, Baie-Comeau, Saguenay, P.Q.
- Dalhousie University Library*. Miss Ivy M. Prikler, Assistant Librarian, Halifax, N.S.
- Dartmouth College Library*, Hanover, New Hampshire, U.S.A.
- Geology and Topography Library*, Dept. of Mines and Resources, Ottawa.
- Hamilton Public Library*. Miss Freda F. Waldon, Librarian, Hamilton, Ont.
- Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery*, San Marino, Calif. Leslie E. Bliss, Librarian; Max Farrand, Director of Research.
- Historical Society of Alberta*. W. Everard Edmonds, Secretary, 11146, 91st Ave., Edmonton, Alta.; M. H. Long, Treasurer.
- Hudson's Bay Company*, Canadian Committee Office, Winnipeg.
- Indiana State Library*, 140 N. Senate Ave., Indianapolis, Indiana. Kenneth R. Shaffer, Order Librarian.
- Institute of Historical Research*, University of London, London, England.
- Kitchener Public Library*. Elizabeth Moore, Librarian, Kitchener.
- Legislative Library of Ontario*, Toronto, Ont. Miss Edith King, Legislative Librarian.
- Legislative Library of Quebec*. G.-E. Marquis, Librarian, Parliament Bldgs., Quebec.
- Library of Congress*, Washington, D.C.
- Library of Parliament*, Ottawa, Ont. F. A. Hardy, Librarian; Félix Desrochers, General Librarian, Ottawa.
- Literary and Historical Society of Quebec*. George A. Clare, President; G. O. Bridge, Treasurer.
- London Public Library*. Richard E. Crouch, Librarian, London, Ont.; James S. Bell, Treasurer.
- McGill University Library*. Richard Pennington, Librarian, Montreal, P.Q.
- McMaster University Library*, Hamilton, Ont.
- MacNab Historical Association*. Wm. MacNab Box, President, P.O. Box 155, Foleyet, Ont.
- Montréal, Collège de*, 1931 rue Sherbrooke ouest, Montréal, P.Q.
- Montreal University Library*, 2900 Mount Royal Blvd., Montreal.
- Mount Royal High School*, Town of Mount Royal, P.Q.
- National Liberal Federation of Canada*, H. E. Kidd, Secretary, 172 Wellington St., Ottawa.
- National Parks Bureau*, Dept. of Mines and Resources, Ottawa, Ont.
- Nova Scotia Historical Society*. B. E. Paterson, President, c/o Halifax Club, Halifax, N.S.; F. A. Lane, Box 38, Secretary.
- Ohio State University, University Library*, Columbus, 10, Ohio, U.S.A.



- Ontario Historical Society.* Miss Jean Waldie, President, Brantford; Geo. W. Spragge, Treasurer, Dept. of Public Records, Toronto.
- Peterborough Public Library,* Peterborough, Ont. Wm. L. Graff, Librarian.
- Prince of Wales College,* Mary Donahoe, Librarian, Charlottetown, P.E.I.
- Princeton University Library,* Princeton, N.J., U.S.A. Julian P. Boyd, Librarian.
- Provincial Library of Alberta.* Mrs. Frank Gostick, Librarian, Edmonton, Alta.
- Provincial Library of British Columbia.* Dr. Willard E. Ireland, Provincial Librarian and Archivist, Parliament Bldgs., Victoria, B.C.
- Provincial Library of Manitoba.* J. L. Johnston, Provincial Librarian, Winnipeg, Man.
- Provincial Library of Saskatchewan.* Mrs. Austin Bothwell, Librarian, Regina, Sask.
- Public Archives of Canada,* Ottawa.
- Québec, Archives de la Province de, Bibliothèque,* Parc de Champ Bataille, Québec.
- Québec, Département de l'Instruction Publique,* Québec.
- Québec, Ministère des Terres et Forêts,* Québec.
- Queen's University Library.* E. C. Kyte, Librarian, Kingston, Ont.
- Regina College Library.* Miss Emma Bell, Librarian, Regina.
- Royal Institute of International Affairs,* St. James's Sq., London, S.W. 1, England.
- Saguenay, La Société Historique du.* Abbé Victor Tremblay, Président; André Lemieux, Secrétaire, Séminaire de Chicoutimi, Chicoutimi, P.Q.
- St-Alexander, Collège de,* R 1, Pointe Gatineau, P.Q.
- Ste-Anne de la Pocatière, Collège de,* Ste-Anne de la Pocatière, P.Q.
- St. Francis Xavier University Library.* Sister Regina Clare, Librarian, Antigonish, N.S.
- Ste-Marie, Collège de,* 1180 rue Bleury, Montréal, P.Q.
- Ste-Thérèse, Séminaire de,* Ste-Thérèse de Blainville, P.Q.
- St-Hyacinthe, Séminaire de,* St-Hyacinthe, P.Q.
- Toronto Public Library.* Charles R. Sanderson, Chief Librarian, College and St. George Sts., Toronto, Ont.
- Trois-Rivières, Séminaire des,* Trois-Rivières, P.Q.
- Trois-Rivières, Société d'Histoire Régionale de,* Séminaire des Trois-Rivières, P.Q.
- United College Library.* E. M. Graham, Librarian, Winnipeg, Man.
- University of British Columbia Library,* Vancouver, B.C.
- University of California Library,* Berkeley, Calif., U.S.A. Harold L. Leupp, Librarian.
- University of Cincinnati Library,* Burnet Woods Park, Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A. Edward A. Henry, Director of Libraries.
- University of Manitoba Library.* Miss Elizabeth Dafoe, Librarian, Winnipeg, Man.
- University of Oregon Library,* Eugene, Oregon.
- University of Toronto Library.* W. S. Wallace, Librarian, Toronto 5.
- University of Western Ontario, University Library,* London, Ont.
- Vancouver Public Library,* E. S. Robinson, Librarian, Vancouver.
- Victoria University Library.* Miss Margaret V. Ray, Library Assistant, Toronto, Ont.
- Webster Canadiana Library,* New Brunswick Museum, Saint John, N.B.
- Wellesley College Library.* Lois E. Engleman, Assistant Librarian, Wellesley 81, Mass., U.S.A.
- Windsor Public Library.* Miss Anne Hume, Librarian, Windsor, Ont.
- Wisconsin State Historical Society,* 816 State St., Madison 6, Wisc., U.S.A.
- Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa.* Mrs. J. M. Somerville, President, Kenniston Apts., Elgin St., Ottawa; Mrs. J. T. MacMillan, Corresponding Secretary, Ottawa; Miss Rita Bennett, Treasurer, 159 Patterson Ave., Ottawa.
- Women's Canadian Historical Society of Toronto.* Miss C. Roberts, President, 20 Earl St., Toronto; Miss Kate Symon, Corresponding Secretary, 68 Avenue Rd., Toronto; Mrs. C. L. Corless, Treasurer.
- Women's Wentworth Historical Society.* Mrs. Hugh Robertson, President, 46 Herkimer St., Hamilton, Ont.; Mrs. George C. Gage, Secretary, 248 Park St. S., Hamilton; Mrs. Wm. Dowie, Treasurer, 24 Ravenscliffe Ave., Hamilton.
- Yale University Library.* Donald G. Wing, Accessions Department, New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.
- York Pioneer and Historical Society,* J. C. Boylen, President, 206 Huron St., Toronto.

## (B) LIFE MEMBERS

- Bell, Dr. Winthrop, Chester, N.S.  
 Brebner, J. Bartlet, Dept. of History, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.  
 Brown, Dr. George W., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto 5.  
 Burt, A. L., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.  
 Chartier, Mgr Emile, 11 rue Gordon, Appt. 3, Sherbrooke.  
 Eames, Frank, Box 180, Gananoque, Ont.  
 Ellis, Ralph, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.  
 Graham, Gerald S., Dept. of History, King's College, Strand, London W.C. 2, Eng.  
 Hardy, Mrs. A. C., Brockville, Ont.  
 Helstrom, C. T. E., Box 27, Gray, Sask.  
 Hudson's Bay Company, Hudson's Bay House, Winnipeg.  
 Hyde, James H., Hotel Savoy-Plaza, 5th Ave., New York, N.Y.  
 Lanctot, Dr. Gustave, 154 Daly Ave., Ottawa.  
 Landon, Fred, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.  
 Leonard, Col. Ibbotson, 782 Wellington St., London, Ont.  
 Long, Morden H., University of Alberta, Edmonton.  
 Lower, Dr. A. R. M., Queen's University, Kingston.  
 Macdonald, Norman, Department of History, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont.  
 Mackenzie, Donald R., 339 Island Park Dr., Ottawa, Ont.  
 Mathews, Mrs. H. C., 70 Navy Street South, Oakville, Ont.  
 Morgan, F. Cleveland, 1455 Union Ave., Montreal, P.Q.  
 Morse, Dr. W. Inglis, 17 Fresh Pond Parkway, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Musson, Charles J., 480 University Ave., Toronto.  
 Myers, Leslie P., 89 Durie St., Toronto 3.  
 Raymond, Hon. D., The Senate, Ottawa, Ont.  
 Rimouski, Evêque de, Rimouski, P.Q.  
 Riordon, Carl, 374 Côte des Neiges Rd., Montreal.  
 Ross, J. K. L., 270 Côte des Neiges Rd., Montreal.  
 Sage, Dr. Walter N., University of British Columbia, Vancouver.  
 Saunders, Richard M., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont.  
 Scott, S. Morley, National Defence College, Fort Frontenac, Kingston.  
 Sifton, Victor, *Winnipeg Free Press*, Winnipeg.  
 Smith, Pemberton, 414 St. James St. W., Montreal.  
 Somerville, Mrs. J. M., 355 B, Kenniston Apts., Elgin St., Ottawa.  
 Soward, Fred H., Dept. of History, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.  
 Stacey, Col. C. P., Dept. of National Defence (Army), Ottawa, Ont.  
 Tombs, Guy, 1111 Beaver Hall Hill, Montreal.  
 Tweed, T. W., 40 Montclair Ave., Toronto 10.  
 Underhill, Frank H., Department of History, University of Toronto, Toronto.  
 Wilson, Hon. Cairine N., The Senate, Ottawa, Ont.  
 Wright, Mrs. E. C., Box 559, Wolfville, N.S.

## (C) ANNUAL MEMBERS

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Adair, E. R., McGill University, Montreal  | Albright, Miss Margaret M., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto 5 |
| Adams, Eric G., 2100 Clarendon Ave., Apt. 3, Montreal                                    | Allard, Mgr J.-A., Maisonnnette, Comté de Gloucester, N.B.                  |
| Addison, Miss Ruth, Economic Research Branch, Dept. of Reconstruction and Supply, Ottawa | Allen, James G., Dept. of History, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.   |
| Agnew, Brig. D. R., Royal Military College, Kingston                                     | Allison, G. C., <i>The Winnipeg Tribune</i> , Winnipeg                      |
| Agnew, D. J., 696 Echo Dr., Ottawa   | Amtmann, Bernard, 169 Daly Ave., Ottawa                                     |
| Aitchison, J. H., Dalhousie University, Halifax  | Anderson, Mrs. J. R., 371 Claremont Ave., Westmount, Montreal               |
| Aitken, H., 369 Harvard St., Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.                                    |   |



ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Anderson, Col. W. A. B., Fort Frontenac, Kingston  
 Anderson, William, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.  
 Andrew, G. C., University of British Columbia, Vancouver  
 Armstrong, Dr. Elizabeth, 2500 Q St., N.W., Washington, D.C.  
 Armstrong, P. C., C.P.R. Co., Montreal  
 Arnold, J. K., 229 Frank St., Ottawa  
 Arrell, Alex H., Cayuga, Ont.
- Bailey, Alfred, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton  
 Barbeau, C.-M., 260 McLaren St., Ottawa  
 Barnett, Major John, The Old House, Clarkson, Ont.  
 Beaugrand-Champagne, Aristide, 1071 Blvd. Mont-Royal, Outremont, P.Q.  
 Beck, J. M., Lunenburg, N.S.  
 Beer, W. A., 120 South Oval, Hamilton  
 Belyea, Miss Eleanor, Asst. Librarian, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton  
 Bernier, J.-E., Chambre 715, 360 rue St-Jacques ouest, Montréal  
 Berridge, Dr. W. A., Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., 1 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y.  
 Binks, Kenneth, University of Saskatchewan, Regina  
 Blackwood, T. A., 331 Robertson St., Victoria  
 Blakeley, Miss Phyllis R., Public Archives of Nova Scotia, Halifax  
 Bogart, Geoffrey L., 4 Wychwood Park, Toronto  
 Bois, H. C., Coopérative Fédérée de Québec, 130 est, rue St-Paul, Montréal  
 Bonar, James C., 611 Lansdowne Ave., Westmount, Montreal  
 Bonenfant, Jean-Charles, Bibliothèque du Parlement, Québec  
 Booth, Mrs. Godfrey, 1044 Collinson St., Victoria  
 Boutilier, Miss Helen R., 976 West 13th Ave., Vancouver  
 Brady, Alexander, Economics Bldg., University of Toronto, Toronto  
 Brault, Lucien, Archives nationales, Ottawa  
 Brining, N. R., 1035 Jean Talon Ave. West, Apt. 9, Montreal 15  
 Britnell, G. E., Dept. of Economics, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon  
 Brouillette, Benoit, Banque Canadienne Nationale, Place d'Armes, Montréal  
 Browne, Col. Peter L., Old Supreme Court Bldg., Ottawa  
 Bruchési, Jean, Sous-Secrétaire de la Province, 273 ave. Laurier, Québec  
 Brunet, Dr. Michel, Faculté des Lettres, Université de Montréal, Montréal  
 Burford, W. T., Canadian Federation of Labour, 78 Bank St., Ottawa
- Burnet, Miss Jean, 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto  
 Buzek, Mrs. Karel, 29 Madison Ave., Toronto 5  
 Cadden, John Paul, St. Francis de Sales Church, 634 Hobart St., Oakland 12, Calif.  
 Calder, J. C., Innisfail, Alta.  
 Calder, Mrs. J. C., Innisfail, Alta.  
 Careless, J. M. S., University of Toronto, Toronto 5  
 Carrière, Joseph M., Box 1786, University Station, Charlottesville, Va.  
 Carrothers, W. A., Public Utilities Comm., 510 Central Bldg., Victoria, B.C.  
 Carter, Miss Gwendolen M., Smith College, Northampton, Mass., U.S.A.  
 Caty, J. J., Ross Mines, Holtyre, Ont.  
 Chartier, Mgr, 11 rue Gordon, Apt. 3, Sherbrooke  
 Chipman, John, Oka, P.Q.  
 Choate, Miss Bessie P., Canadian Bank of Commerce, Vancouver  
 Church, H. B., Barrister, Orangeville, Ont.  
 Clark, S. Delbert, 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto  
 Clay, Miss Margaret J., Apt. 101, 861 Linden Ave., Victoria  
 Clerihue, V. R., 789 W. Pender St., Vancouver  
 Cleverdon, Miss Catherine L., 33 Deshon Ave., Bronxville, N.Y.  
 Coats, Dr. R. H., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto  
 Cohen, Maxwell, 1020 Pine Ave. W., Montreal  
 Colby, C. W., 1240 Pine Ave. W., Montreal  
 Coleman, E. H., Canadian Legation, Havana, Cuba  
 Collins, Ross W., Dept. of History, University of Alberta, Edmonton  
 Conacher, J. B., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto  
 Condon, Miss Catherine A., 70 College Ave., Ottawa  
 Cooke, A. C., University of British Columbia, Vancouver  
 Cooper, H. S., Room 10, 42 James St. S., Hamilton, Ont.  
 Cooper, John Irwin, McGill University, Montreal  
 Corey, Albert B., Sunset Rd., R.D. 1, Castleton, N.Y.  
 Cornell, P. G., Dept. of History, Acadia University, Wolfville, N.S.  
 Coutts, G. B., 517 Seventh Ave. W., Calgary  
 Coyne, James E., 605 Mayfair Apts., Metcalfe St., Ottawa  
 Craig, Gerald M., University of Toronto, Toronto 5  
 Crean, J. G., 18 Balmuto St., Toronto



ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Creighton, Donald G., Baldwin House,  
University of Toronto, Toronto
- Croteau, Lionel, Public Archives, Ottawa
- Crouse, Nellis M., 414 Cayuga Heights  
Rd., Ithaca, N.Y.
- Cunningham & Co., 165 Sparks St.,  
Ottawa
- Currie, A. W., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
- Dadson, Thomas, Wolfville, N.S.
- Dales, J. H., Purvis Hall, McGill Univer-  
sity, Montreal
- Davis, R. E. G., Canadian Welfare Coun-  
cil, 245 Cooper St., Ottawa
- Davison, Martin A., 181 Redpath Ave.,  
Toronto 12
- Demers, M. le juge Philippe, Palais de  
Justice, Montréal
- Dent, C. R., 24 Rowanwood Ave., To-  
ronto
- Derome, Gaston, 8263 rue Drolet, Mont-  
réal 10
- D'Eschambault, M. l'abbé Antoine, Pres-  
bytère St. Emile, St. Emile's Rectory,  
B.P. Genthon, Man.
- Desranleau, S. Exc. Mgr P., Sherbrooke,  
P.Q.
- d'Haucourt, Miss Genevieve, 1719 Massa-  
chusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C.
- Dickson, Mrs. J. R., "Rideaufields", P.O.  
Box 743, Ottawa
- Dobbin, R. L., Reid St., Peterborough,  
Ont.
- Donnelly, R. P. Joseph P., Saint Louis  
University, Saint Louis 3, Mo.
- Dorland, Arthur Garratt, University of  
Western Ontario, London, Ont.
- Douglas, Dr. H. T., 212 Rideau Terrace,  
Ottawa
- Duff, Louis Blake, Niagara Finance Com-  
pany Limited, Welland, Ont.
- Eager, Miss Evelyn, University of Sas-  
katchewan, Saskatoon
- Eastman, S. Mack, 2776 Pine St., Van-  
couver
- Edwards, W. A., 4384 Sherbrooke St. W.,  
Westmount, Montreal
- Egan, Rev. D'Arcy L., St. Alphonsus  
Seminary, Woodstock, Ont.
- Elliott, Mrs. M. E., c/o The Royal Mili-  
tary College, Kingston
- Ells, Miss Margaret, Public Archives of  
Nova Scotia, Halifax
- England, Robert, Comox, V.I., B.C.
- Fabre-Surveyer, L'hon. juge E., 128, ave.  
Maplewood, Outremont, P.Q.
- Falardeau, J. C., 12 Haldimand St.,  
Quebec
- Farr, David M. L., New College, Oxford,  
England
- Feasby, W. J., 112 Bedford Rd., Toronto
- Fee, Norman, Public Archives of Canada,  
Ottawa
- Fergusson, C. Bruce, Public Archives of  
Nova Scotia, Halifax
- Ferns, H. S., Trinity College, Cambridge,  
England
- Fieldhouse, H. N., Dept. of History, Mc-  
Gill University, Montreal
- Finucane, Rev. T., Campion College,  
Regina
- Firestone, O. J., Dept. of Trade and Com-  
merce, No. 4 Temporary Bldg., Ottawa
- Firth, Miss Frances, 508 Charlotte St.,  
Fredericton
- Flemington, Frank, The Ryerson Press,  
299 Queen St. W., Toronto
- Flenley, R., Baldwin House, University of  
Toronto, Toronto
- Flucke, A. F., 3811 Miramontes Dr., Vic-  
toria, B.C.
- Flynn, Oscar R., Jr., Seabrook Farms,  
Bridgeton, N.J., U.S.A.
- Fodchuk, Miss Mary J., Wadena, Sask.
- Foster, Miss Joan, Trafalgar School for  
Girls, Montreal
- Fox, Paul W., Carleton College, Ottawa
- Fraser, A. M., Memorial University Col-  
lege, St. John's, Nfld.
- Fraser, Clarence, Peel Gardens, Port  
Credit, Ont.
- Frazer, Gordon, 200 Huron St., Stratford
- Frégault, Guy, 3275 ave. Lacombe, Apt.  
3, Montréal 26
- Gamble, C. L., 212 Park Ave., Brantford,  
Ont.
- Garner, John, 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
- Gartz, Victor E., 1321 Sherbrooke St. W.,  
Montreal 25
- Gelley, T. F., Royal Military College,  
Kingston
- Gibson, Frederick W., 151 Union St. W.,  
Kingston, Ont.
- Gibson, James A., Carleton College, Ot-  
tawa
- Gibson, John Aubrey, 912 Federal Bldg.,  
85 Richmond St. W., Toronto 1
- Glazebrook, G. de T., Defence Research  
Board, National Defence Department,  
Ottawa
- Glover, Richard G., University of Mani-  
toba, Winnipeg
- Gomme, E. A., 35 Glendale Ave., Toronto
- Gordon, H. Scott, Carleton College,  
Ottawa
- Gostick, Mrs. Frank, 8514, 104th St.,  
Edmonton
- Gouin, Jacques, 46 Sweetland Ave., Ot-  
tawa
- Graham, William Roger, Regina College,  
University of Saskatchewan, Regina
- Grant, L. S., 4064 West 15th Ave., Van-  
couver
- Grantham, Ronald, Editorial Dept., Ot-  
tawa Citizen, Ottawa
- Gravel, C.-E., 3570 rue McTavish, Mont-  
réal
- Gregory, Herbert W., Public Archives,  
Ottawa

ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Griffin, John William, 226 Bay St., Toronto 1  
 Groulx, Chanoine Lionel, 261 ave. Bloomfield, Outremont, P.Q.  
 Gundy, H. Pearson, Queen's University, Kingston  
 Hahn, Paul, 22 Bloor St. E., Toronto  
 Hahn, Mrs. Paul, 7 Lynwood Ave., Toronto  
 Halpenny, Miss Frances G., University of Toronto Press, Toronto 5  
 Harris & Co., Ltd., W. C., 21 Jordan St., Toronto 1  
 Hart, A. F., 145 Stanley Ave., Ottawa  
 Harvey, Daniel C., Public Archives of Nova Scotia, Halifax  
 Harwood, C. A., K.C., "Alaincour", Vaudreuil, P.Q.  
 Havens, Edmund G., R.F.D. No. 1, Box 210, Henderson, Colo.  
 Heaton, Herbert, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.  
 Helleiner, K. F., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto  
 Helstrom, Theodore, Box 27, Gray, Sask.  
 Heron, John R., 14 Murray Gardens, Pointe Claire, P.Q.  
 Hitchins, Fred H., 140 Kenilworth St., Ottawa  
 Hitsman, J. Mackay, Historical Section, Dept. of National Defence, Ottawa  
 Hubbard, Dr. Robert H., National Gallery, Ottawa  
 Hughes, Samuel H. S., Welland, Ont.  
 Innis, Harold A., Economics Bldg., University of Toronto, Toronto  
 Ireland, Willard E., Provincial Library and Archives, Victoria, B.C.  
 Jackson, H. M., Dept. of Veterans Affairs, Carling Ave., Ottawa  
 Jefferys, Charles W., York Mills, Ont.  
 Jennings, F. C., Librarian, Carnegie Library, Ottawa  
 Jensen, V. J., St. Paul's College, Winnipeg  
 Johnston, J. G., Northern Ontario Bldg., Toronto 2, Ont.  
 Johnston, Robert A. A., 112 Old Forest Hill Rd., Toronto  
 Jones, Robert L., Ph.D., Marietta College, Marietta, Ohio  
 Josie, Capt. G. H., 261 Laurier Ave. E., Ottawa, Ont.  
 Keep, George R. C., c/o Mrs. Ferris, The Old Hall, East Bridgford, Notts, England  
 Kerr, D. G. G., Mount Allison University, Sackville, N.B.  
 Ketcheson, Fred G., Yonge St., Richmond Hill, Ont.  
 Kinchen, Oscar A., Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas  
 King, G. B., 539 Douglas Ave., Toronto 12  
 Krever, H., 279 Belsize Dr., Toronto  
 Laing, Dr. L. H., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.  
 Lamb, W. Kaye, Public Archives, Ottawa  
 Lambert, Hon. Norman P., The Senate, Ottawa  
 Lamontagne, Léopold, Royal Military College, Kingston  
 Lanctot, J. B., 631 Logan St., St. Lambert, P.Q.  
 Lane, J. B., Apt. 7, 21 Cooper St., Ottawa  
 Langlois, Jean Sandfield Macdonald, Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa, Ont.  
 LaViolette, F. E., Tulane University, New Orleans 18, La.  
 Lawson, Dr. Murray G., History Dept., Syracuse University, Syracuse 10, N.Y.  
 Lawson, R. W., 612 Bank St., Apt. 22, Ottawa  
 Layng, Theodore Edmund, Public Archives, Ottawa  
 Lebel, Paul, 206 Brown Ave., Quebec  
 Lee, Thomas R., Ingersoll *Tribune*, Ingersoll, Ont.  
 Lefebvre, J. J., Palais de Justice, Montréal  
 Le Grand, Albert, Royal Military College, Kingston  
 Lerner, Arthur, 1900 Clinton Ave., Montreal  
 Levick, A. A., 7017 Sherbrooke St., West Montreal, P.Q.  
 Lewis, J. M., 31 Ramezy Rd., Westmount, Montreal  
 Lingard, Cecil C., 14 Old Mill Terrace, Toronto 9  
 Little, W. J., Victoria University, Toronto  
 Long, Mrs. Ernest E., 663 Dollard Blvd., Outremont, P.Q.  
 Longley, R. S., Dept. of History, Acadia University, Wolfville, N.S.  
 Longstaff, Major Frederick Victor, Seabank, 50 King George Terrace, Victoria  
 Lovell, Colin Rhys, University of Southern California, University Park, Los Angeles 7, Calif.  
 Lunn, Miss Jean, Public Archives, Ottawa  
 McCarter, W. K., 3507 Cadboro Bay Rd., Victoria  
 McClung, Miss Helen, Ontario Archives, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto  
 McCree, H. D., Box 108, Ottawa  
 McCulley, Joseph, Deputy Commissioner of Penitentiaries, Justice Bldg., Ottawa  
 MacDonell, Malcolm, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, N.S.  
 McEachern, F. F., 109 Glenayr Rd., Toronto  
 MacFarlane, R. O., Dept. of Education, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg  
 MacGibbon, D. A., McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont.  
 McGibbon, D. W., Imperial Oil Ltd., 56 Church St., Toronto



ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- McGregor, D. C., 800 St. Georges Ave., N. Vancouver  
 McIlwraith, T. F., Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto  
 McInnis, Edgar, University of Toronto, Toronto 5, Ont.  
 McKelvie, B. A., Lafortune Rd., Cobble Hill, V.I., B.C.  
 MacKinnon, Frank, Prince of Wales College, Charlottetown, P.E.I.  
 MacKinnon, Rev. Hugh, St. Paul's College, Winnipeg  
 Mackintosh, W. A., Queen's University, Kingston  
 MacKirdy, K. A., University of New Brunswick, Fredericton  
 MacLaren, C. H., 14 Metcalfe St., Ottawa  
 MacLeod, Mrs. Margaret Arnett, 138 Maryland St., Winnipeg  
 MacLeod, W. A., Can. Co-operative Wheat Producers, Ltd., Winnipeg  
 McMahon, Miss M. H., 77 Powell Ave., Ottawa  
 MacNab, John E., 1529 Ogden St., N.W., Washington, D.C.  
 McNaught, K. W., 458 Montague Ave., Winnipeg  
 MacNaughton, Miss Katherine F., 3 Victoria St., Campbellton, N.B.  
 MacNutt, W. S., History Dept., University of New Brunswick, Fredericton  
 Macpherson, Miss Marion, U.N. Division, Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa  
 McOuat, Donald F., 48 Montreal St., Sherbrooke, P.Q.  
 McVean, Wm. C., 237 Lonsmount Dr., Toronto 10  
 Machum, L. A., 13 Enterprise St., Moncton, N.B.  
 Maheux, M. l'abbé Arthur, Archiviste, Université Laval, Québec  
 Major, T. G., Box 125, Port of Spain, Trinidad, B.W.I.  
 Malchelosse, Gérard, 5759, ave. Durocher, Montréal  
 Mallory, J. R., McGill University, Montreal  
 Manny, Miss Louise, Newcastle, Miramichi, N.B.  
 Marchand, G., 59 St. James St. W., Montreal  
 Martin, Chester, Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto  
 Massey, Hon. Vincent, Batterwood House, Port Hope, Ont.  
 Masters, D. C., Bishop's University, Lennoxville, P.Q.  
 Matthews, Mrs. H. C., Navy St., Oakville, Ont.  
 Matthews, W. D., Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa  
 Maurault, Mgr Olivier, 1000 est, boulevard Crémazie, Montréal  
 Maxwell, Mrs. E. J., 603 Belleville St., Victoria  
 Mayo, H. B., Dept. of Political Science, University of Alberta, Edmonton  
 Miller, Harry, 63 Merton Rd., Hampstead, P.Q.  
 Miller, Roscoe R., 212 Lauder Ave., Toronto 10  
 Mills, L. J., Director of Financial Services, Post Office Dept., Ottawa  
 Milne, C. V., 217 Dominion Bank Bldg., Calgary  
 Moir, John S., 36 McGillivray St., Toronto 12  
 Monahan, F., 1844 Allison Rd., Vancouver  
 Moore, Horace E., The Empress Hotel, Victoria, B.C.  
 Morin, R. P. Conrad, 3113 ave. Guyard, Montréal, 26  
 Morin, Victor, 57 ouest, rue Saint-Jacques, Montréal  
 Morisset, Gérard, 721 rue Saint-Cyrille, Québec  
 Morris, Edmund, 35 Cambridge St., Halifax  
 Morrison, Neil, C.B.C., 354 Jarvis St., Toronto  
 Morrison, Miss Ruth M., University of British Columbia, Vancouver  
 Morton, W. L., University of Manitoba, Winnipeg  
 Mulkerns, Major John Stuart, Valley Forge Military Academy, Wayne, Penn.  
 Mullally, Dr. Emmet J., 2021 Union Ave., Montreal  
 Mulock, William J., 172 Wellington St., Ottawa  
 Mulvihill, Rev. D. J., Assumption College, Windsor  
 Munro, W. B., 268 Bellefontaine St., Pasadena, Calif.  
 Munroe, David C., Macdonald College, Ste. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.  
 Murphy, Miss Ethel, Box 145, Clarkson, Ont.  
 Murray, Miss Jean E., University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon  
 Murray, W. H., 36 Churchill Ave., Westmount, P.Q.  
 Mylrea, A. J., c/o Reed, Shaw & McNaught, Ins., 64 Wellington St. W., Toronto 1  
 Nadeau, Dr. Gabriel, Rutland State Sanatorium, Rutland, Mass.  
 Neatby, Miss Hilda, Royal Commission, Laurentian Bldg., Ottawa  
 Neufeld, Irvin G., Tabor College, Hillsboro, Kansas  
 Nicholson, Lt.-Col. G. W. L., Historical Section, Dept. of National Defence, Ottawa  
 O'Connell, M. P., 80 Glen Road, Toronto  
 Oleson, T. J., Dept. of History, United College, Winnipeg  
 Ormsby, Miss Margaret A., Dept. of History, University of British Columbia, Vancouver



ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Ormsby, William G., Public Archives, Ottawa
- Papineau, Mgr, Evêché de Joliette, Joliette, P.Q.
- Parizeau, Gérard, 10 ave. Glencoe, Outremont, P.Q.
- Patrick, James S., Public Archives, Ottawa
- Peardon, Thos. P., Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
- Peers, F. W., C.B.C., 354 Jarvis St., Toronto
- Penlington, Dr. Norman, Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich.
- Pentland, H. C., University of Manitoba, Winnipeg
- Peterson, Miss Bernice, 232 Dunn Ave., Toronto
- Phillips, A. T., 324 Montrose Ave., East Kildonan, Manitoba
- Pickersgill, J. W., Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa
- Pierce, Lorne, The Ryerson Press, Toronto
- Podea, Mrs. Iris S., 817 Fifth Ave., New York 21, N.Y.
- Porter, J. A., Carleton College, Ottawa
- Potter, Harold H., Sir George Williams College, Montreal
- Potvin, M. l'abbé Pascal, Archives, Université Laval, Québec
- Pouliot, R. P. Adrien, Collège des Jésuites, Québec
- Preston, Anthony W., Bishop's University, Lennoxville, P.Q.
- Preston, R. A., Royal Military College, Kingston
- Pritchett, John Perry, Queen's College, College of the City of New York, New York
- Proctor, N., 991 Côté St., Montreal
- Prodrick, Capt. R. G., 241 Park Rd., Rockcliffe, Ottawa
- Raisty, L. B., Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Decatur, Georgia
- Reaman, G. E., Dept. of English, Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph
- Reid, Miss Allana, 152 Hillcrest Ave., Montreal West, P.Q.
- Reid, J. H. Stewart, Dept. of History, United College, Winnipeg
- Reynolds, Ralph E., 91 Russell Ave., Ottawa
- Richardson, A. J. H., Public Archives, Ottawa
- Rife, C. W., Hamline University, St. Paul 4, Minn.
- Ritchie, Ronald S., Imperial Oil Co. Ltd., 56 Church St., Toronto
- Robbins, Dr. J. E., 166 Marlborough Ave., Ottawa
- Robinson, Percy J., 21 Highland Cres., Toronto 5
- Roe, Frank Gilbert 2547 Killarney Rd., Cadboro Bay, Victoria
- Rolland, Herman J., 4318 Earncliffe Ave., Montreal
- Rolph, W. K., Washington Square College, New York University, New York
- Rosenberg, L., 493 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal
- Ross, Miss Aileen D., 1514 MacKay St., Montreal
- Ross, Miss Dorothy, 367 Metcalfe Ave., Westmount
- Rothney, Gordon O., Sir George Williams College, Montreal
- Roy, Antoine, Archives de la Province, Parc des Champs de Batailles, Québec
- Roy, James A., 86 Findhorn Place, Edinburgh 9, Scotland
- Rutherford, W. D., Brantford Board of Trade, Hotel Kerby, Brantford, Ont.
- Sage, Donald, 4687 W. Fourth Ave., Vancouver
- Sametz, Z. W., 435 MacLaren St., Ottawa
- Samuel, Dr. Sigmund, 104 Forest Hill Rd., Toronto
- Sanderson, Charles R., Chief Librarian, Toronto Public Library, Toronto
- Saunders, Robert, 5 Winter St., St. Paul, Minn.
- Saunders, S. A., 57 Roxborough St. W., Toronto
- Schaeffer, M. B., 228 N. LaSalle St., Room 953, Chicago 1, Ill.
- Schull, Joseph, St. Eustache-sur-le-lac, Quebec
- Schuyler, R. L., Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
- Scott, F. R., McGill University, Montreal
- Secretary of State, Canadian Citizenship Branch, 103 West Block, Ottawa
- Seeley, M. J., 40 Cameron Ave., Ottawa
- Setton, Kenneth M., History Dept., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 4, Penn.
- Shantz, Glen O., 1141 View St., Victoria
- Shiels, Archie W., Pacific American Fisheries, South Bellingham, Wash.
- Simpson, Geo. W., University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon
- Sissons, C. B., Victoria College, Toronto
- Sjostedt, Mrs. Jessie Winslow, 253 Chapel St., Ottawa
- Skilling, H. G., 552 Riverside Drive, New York 27, N.Y.
- Slater, E. H., 391 Talbot St., Market Sq., London, Ont.
- Small, C. J., 12 Keith St., Toronto
- Smith, Goldwin, College of Liberal Arts, Wayne University, Detroit 1, Mich.
- Smith, H. Greville, Canadian Industries, Ltd., Box 1260, Montreal
- Smith, Joe Patterson, Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.
- Smith, Wilfred, Public Archives, Ottawa
- Spragge, G. W., Department of Public Records, Toronto 5

ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Sprague, Robert H., International House, 1414 East 59th St., Chicago, Ill.  
 Spry, Mrs. Graham, 28 Chester St., London S.W. 1, England  
 Spurr, J. W., Librarian, Royal Military College, Kingston  
 Stanley, George F. G., Royal Military College, Kingston  
 Steadman, T. Park, Sandwich Collegiate Inst., Windsor, Ont.  
 Stewart, Miss Alice R., University of Maine, Orono, Maine  
 Stewart, Kenneth, 529 Osborne Ave., Verdun, P.Q.  
 Stovel, Dr. H. V., P.O. Box 331, Station B, Montreal  
 Strang, D. M., 1285 W. 15th Ave., Vancouver  
 Strange, H. G. L., c/o Searle Grain Co., Winnipeg  
 Talman, James J., University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.  
 Tanguay, Dr. Rodolphe, 19 Durham St., Sudbury, Ont.  
 Taschereau, L'hon. L.-A., 187 Grande Allée, Québec  
 Taylor, Malcolm G., c/o Health Services Planning Comm., Regina  
 Taylor, R. K., Press Gallery, House of Commons, Ottawa  
 Thatcher, Max B., Dept. of Government, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.  
 Thomas, L. G., Dept. of History, University of Alberta, Edmonton  
 Thomas, Lewis H., 2217 Cameron St., Regina  
 Thompson, Frederic F., Blvd. Apts. 27, 2282 West Grand Blvd., Detroit 8, Mich.  
 Thomson, G. C., Barrister-at-law, Swift Current, Sask.  
 Tomlinson, C. P., 3940 Côte des Neiges Rd., Montreal  
 Topping, C. W., University of British Columbia, Vancouver  
 Tremblay, Maurice, 266 ouest, rue St-Jacques, ch. 218, Montréal  
 Trotter, Reginald G., Queen's University, Kingston  
 Trudel, Marcel, Laval University, Quebec  
 Tucker, Gilbert Norman, University of British Columbia, Vancouver  
 Tucker, Dean H., Mount Allison University, Sackville, N.B.  
 Turcot, Jules, Séminaire de Québec, Université Laval, Québec  
 Turner, Rev. W. N., 1419, 8th Avenue East, Calgary  
 Tyrrell, J. B., 14 Walmer Rd., Toronto  
 Van Alstyne, Richard W., University of Southern California, University Park, Los Angeles 7, Calif.  
 Vince, Donald H. Raban, Dept. of History, McGill University, Montreal  
 Wade, Hugh Mason, Cornish, New Hampshire  
 Waines, W. J., University of Manitoba, Winnipeg  
 Waldon, Miss Freda, 14 Duke St., Hamilton  
 Walter, T. Dayman, 2442 Gladstone Ave., Windsor, Ont.  
 Ward, F. Glenn, Carleton College, Ottawa  
 Warner, Donald F., Dept. of History, Macalester College, St. Paul 5, Minn.  
 Watson, J. W., Geographic Bureau, Dept. of Mines and Resources, Ottawa  
 Webster, H. G., 90 Perry St., Woodstock, Ont.  
 Weir, S. E., K.C., Bank of Commerce Bldg., Dundas and Richmond Sts., London, Ont.  
 Whitton, Miss Charlotte, 236 C Rideau Terrace, Ottawa  
 Williams, E. K., Huron and Erie Bldg., Winnipeg  
 Willms, A. M., Public Archives, Ottawa  
 Willoughby, Wm. R., 43 Buck St., Canton, N.Y.  
 Wills, Harold A., c/o Northland Post, Cochrane, Ont.  
 Wilson, George E., Dalhousie University, Halifax  
 Winkler, H. W., Morden, Man.  
 Winter, Carl G., 2417, 6th Ave., Sacramento 17, Calif.  
 Wise, Sydney F., Dept. of History, Royal Military College, Kingston  
 Wittke, Carl F., Dean of Graduate Studies, Western Reserve University, Cleveland 6, Ohio  
 Woodley, E. C., 3787 Côte des Neiges, Apt. 209, Montreal 25  
 Woodyatt, James B., 355 St. James St. W., Montreal  
 Wrong, H. Hume, Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa  
 Younge, Miss Eva, 3600 University St., Montreal 2  
 Zacour, N. P., John Jay Hall, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.  
 Zaslow, Morris, 329 Euclid Ave., Toronto

29  
8094-46H











4 573

## Date Due

[illegible]

CAT. NO. 23 233

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



F5000 .C26 1950  
Canadian Historical Assoc  
Rapport...  
**RESERVE** 113200  
**Reserve:**

*Canadian*  
113200

113200

